DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 127 881 HE 008 193

AUTHOR Luthans, Fred
TITLE The Faculty Promotion Process. An Empirical Analysis of the Administration of Large State Universities.
INSTITUTION Iowa Univ., Iowa City. Bureau of Business and Economic Research.
PUB DATE 67
NOTE 108p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$6.01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrative Policy; Career Ladders; *Centralization; *College Faculty; Educational Administration; Employment Opportunities; *Faculty Promotion; *Higher Education; Instructional Staff; Job Development; Job Satisfaction; Policy Formation; *State Universities; *University Administration

ABSTRACT

One phase of academic management, the faculty promotion process, is systematically described and analyzed. The study encompasses three parts: (1) the justification of the use of management concepts in the analysis of academic administration; (2) a descriptive presentation of promotion policies and practices in 46 large state universities; and (3) analysis with empirical data of the central control of decentralized business faculty promotions. Only eight percent of the faculty sample felt their present promotion process was well accepted and contributed to high morale. Results of the analysis of this study indicate that there is a lack of effective central control over faculty promotion policies and practices. Conclusions are drawn that have implications for academic administration regarding promotion policies, practices, and central control. (LBH)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

IN 67-8

ED1278 81

The Faculty Promotion Process

An Empirical Analysis of the Administration of Large State Universities

By FRED LUTHANS

HE008 193

BUREAU OF BUSINESS AND ECONOMIC RESEARCH
UNIVERSITY OF IOWA, IOWA CITY

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

2

MCMXVIII

American Council on Education
Washington, D. C.

The Faculty Promotion Process

An Empirical Analysis of the Management of Large State Universities

By Fred Luthans

BUREAU OF BUSINESS AND ECONOMIC RESEARCH
COLLEGE OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION
THE UNIVERSITY OF IOWA, IOWA CITY
1967

Preface

The large university is recognized as an important organization in our modern society. The faculty members of large universities conduct most of the significant research in their particular fields of study. For example, in the business colleges of our large universities, professors of organization and management devote their research efforts to developing knowledge and insights into industrial organizations. Yet, despite the ascribed importance attached to the university with all the various kinds of research emitting from its walls, the faculty researchers have not bothered to take an introspective analysis of the university itself as a functioning organization. This study is an attempt to fill some of this research void on the university as an organized activity.

The author, in an extensive search of the literature in this field, uncovered a negligible amount of work which could be considered as a systematic analysis or empirical study of the academic management of universities. This does not imply that nothing has been written on the topic. Many publications dealing with university administration and various related subjects abound in the literature but, with very few exceptions, nothing approaches a systematic analysis of the academic administration of universities. Therefore, this study was undertaken to systematically describe and analyze one phase of academic management—the faculty promotion process.

The study can be broken into essentially three parts. The first part tries to justify the use of management concepts in the analysis of academic administration. Although many scholars and practicing university administrators may not agree with this part of the study, a point of departure seems necessary. The second part is a highly descriptive presentation of promotion policies and practices in forty-six large state universities. The third and major portion of the study utilizes empirical data to analyze central control of decentralized business faculty promotions. The conclusions and implications from this analysis should have direct applicability, or at least provoke some serious thinking and reassessment by practicing university administrators.

I have attempted to make a contribution to the better understanding of the administration of our great universities. This study was completed only because of the excellent cooperation I received from over 250 anonymous university administrators and faculty members. I give my sincere appreciation for their contributions. Furthermore, I am particularly indebted to Dr. Henry H. Albers, Professor of Management at The University of Iowa, for his invaluable advice and assistance in all aspects of the study. My thanks also go to Professors Max S. Wortman, Jr., George C. Hoyt, Anthony Costantino, and Milton E. Rosenbaum, all of The University of Iowa, for reading the entire manuscript and making helpful criticisms. I would also like to acknowledge the editing assistance I received from Dr. L. G. Sgontz, Edith Ennis, and Sue Schumacher, of the Bureau of Business and Economic Research, The University of Iowa. Finally, thanks go to my wife, Kay, for editing and typing assistance in various stages of the manuscript and for her understanding and encouragement.

Fred Luthans[*]
Office of Military Psychology and Leadership
United States Corps of Cadets
West Point, New York

---

[*] Effective June, 1967, Dr. Luthans will become a member of the faculty of the University of Nebraska with the rank of Associate Professor of Management.

Table of Contents

PREFACE iii

LIST OF TABLES vii

Chapter

I. THE BACKGROUND FOR THE STUDY OF ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATION 1
  The General Importance of the Study 1
  The Use of Management Concepts in the Analysis of Academic Administration 4

II. SOME CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE STUDY OF ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATION 18
  Minor Contributions of Noted Writers from Other Fields 18
  The Quantity of Literature on University Administration 21
  The Quality of Literature on University Administration 22

III. THE SPECIFIC PROBLEM AND THE METHOD OF RESEARCH 31
  The Problem Investigated 31
  The Method Used in the Investigation 36

IV. PROMOTION POLICIES AND PRACTICES IN FORTY-SIX LARGE STATE UNIVERSITIES 43
  University-Wide Promotion Policies and Practices 43
  Decentralized Promotion Policies and Practices 52
  Summary of Promotion Policies and Practices 57

V. THE ANALYSIS OF CENTRAL CONTROL OF DECENTRALIZED BUSINESS FACULTY PROMOTIONS 59
  The Role of Promotion Policies in Central Control 59
  The Role of Central Control in Promotion Practices 66
  The Direct Exercise of Central Control 74

VI. SOME CONCLUDING COMMENTS 83
  Summary 85
  Implications 89

List of Tables

2-1 Backgrounds of the Major Contributors to the Literature on University Administration 23
4-1 The Responses of Central University Administrators to a Survey of Faculty Promotion Policies and Practices 43
4-2 The Characteristics of University-Wide Promotion Policies as Described by Central Administrators 45
4-3 Objective Faculty Evaluation Methods Utilized by Central Administrators 48
4-4 Central Administrators' Perceptions of the Weights Attached to Various Promotion Criteria (Associate Professor of Business to Full Professor) 49
4-5 Central Administrators' Weighting of Influence in Various Positions in Promotion Decisions (Associate Professor of Business to Full Professor) 50
4-6 Central Administrators' Weighting of the Influence of Organizational Levels in the Promotion Process (Associate Professor of Business to Full Professor) 51
4-7 The Responses of Business College Administrators to a Survey of Faculty Promotion Policies and Practices 52
4-8 Objective Faculty Evaluation Methods Utilized by Decentral Administrators 55
4-9 Decentralized Administrations' Perceptions of the Weights Attached to Various Promotion Criteria (Associate Professor of Business to Full Professor) 55
4-10 Decentral Administrators' Weighting of the Influence of Various Positions in Promotion Decisions (Associate Professor of Business to Full Professor) 56
4-11 Decentral Administrations' Weighting of the Influence of Organizational Levels in the Promotion Process (Associate Professor of Business to Full Professor) 56
5-1 Faculty Respondents' Career Patterns in Their Present Institution 60
5-2 Faculty Members' Participation in the Promotion Process 60

5-3 Faculty Members' Publishing Record Prior to Their Current Rank 61
5-4 Business Faculty Members' Descriptions of the Promotion Policies of Their Universities 61
5-5 Faculty Members' Descriptions of Promotion Policies in Universities Where Central Administrators Described the Policies as Spelled Out and Known by Everyone 63
5-6 Central Administrations' Descriptions of Promotion Policies in Universities Having Faculty Members Who State Non-Existent or Nebulous Promotion Policies 63
5-7 Business Faculty Members' Descriptions of the Consensus of Themselves and Their Colleagues Concerning Promotion Policies and Practices to Full Professor 64
5-8 Central Administrators' Views on Being Able to Objectively Evaluate Faculty Members' Research Activity and Teaching Ability 67
5-9 Business Faculty Members' Views on Being Evaluated by Central Administrators According to Present University Faculty Evaluation Procedures and Practices 67
5-10 Decentral Administrators' Views on Being Able to Objectively Evaluate Faculty Members' Research Activity and Teaching Ability 70
5-11 Business Faculty Members' Views on Being Evaluated by Decentral Administrators According to Present University Faculty Evaluation Procedures and Practices 70
5-12 Business Faculty Members' Perceptions of the Weights Presently Attached to Various Promotion Criteria (Associate Professor of Business to Full Professor) 71
5-13 Business Faculty Members' Weighting of Various Positions' Influence in the Promotion Process 72
5-14 Frequency of Central Administrators' Rejection of a Positive Recommendation from Below 75
5-15 Frequency of Decentral Administrators' Rejection of a Positive Recommendation from Below 78
5-16 Frequency of Central Administrators' Approval of Promotions to Full Professor to Faculty Members Who Have Few, If Any, Publications 80

Chapter I

The Background for the Study of Academic Administration

This study describes and analyzes the faculty promotion process in large universities. Particular attention is given to central administrative control over decentralized promotional policies and practices.

GENERAL IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY

The modern world is characterized by large, complex organizations. Business and industry, the armed forces, government, hospitals, universities, and even churches are being challenged by increasing size and complexity. This challenge is being met in most organizations by enlightened administration.

A few generations ago the scale of operations of most organizations offered few problems for effective management. Typically, the owner-manager of a business firm had few employees and produced a single product or service. Government bureaus were administered by an elected or appointed official with the aid of a small clerical staff, and the university president "managed" his band of scholars, students, and business affairs in a congenial, community atmosphere. Management of today's organizations is not as simple. The tremendous growth and diversification experienced by most institutions require new management knowledge and techniques.

Business organizations have met this requirement by developing a body of management knowledge capable of handling large, complex operations. Practicing executives, such as Henri Fayol, Alfred P. Sloan, and James C. Worthy, met their organizations' problems head on. They borrowed much from existing administrative knowledge and developed new concepts. When Sloan became president of General Motors Corporation he was faced with many organizational problems. He solved these problems mainly by putting into effect his Plan of Organization, which was, essentially, central control of decentralized operations. This plan was a highly original adaptation but was based on existing management knowl-

1

edge primarily derived from the military line-staff concept and the scalar principle of the Roman Catholic Church and its use of semi-independent units.[1]

Henri Fayol,[2] James C. Worthy,[3] and many other practicing executives and academic people from business administration and the behavioral sciences have solved many business problems by using management knowledge and techniques.

The body of management knowledge is generally associated with business organizations. However, other institutions in our society are not precluded from utilizing management knowledge to solve their problems. Hospitals, government organizations, and the military draw from and add to the general body of management knowledge.[4]

Can today's large universities make a similar claim? The typical large university is not a band of scholars teaching a few hundred students but has often evolved into what Clark Kerr has termed the "multiversity."[5] The multiversity is not only characterized by a large student body and faculty, but also has an elaborate network of directly and indirectly supporting activities.[6] Can these universities be managed as they have been for the past two or three generations? In the first place, no consistent body of knowledge presently exists in academic administration. The nature of the university lends itself to confusing and often conflicting statements as to its governance.

---

[1] Ernest Dale, "Contributions to Administration by Alfred P. Sloan, Jr., and GM," *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 1, No. 1 (June, 1956), pp. 56-7; and Ernest Dale, *The Great Organizers* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1960), pp. 71-113.

See also: James D. Mooney and Alan C. Reiley, *The Principles of Organization* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1939).

[2] Fayol was a French executive and mining engineer. He became general manager of Commentry-Fourchambault, a mining concern that was in critical financial condition. Fayol credited the management methods he employed rather than personal qualities for putting the company on a sound financial basis. Henri Fayol, *General and Industrial Management* (London: Sir Isaac Pitman & Sons, Ltd., 1949).

[3] James C. Worthy, a Sears Roebuck vice-president, argued that the company should increase the span of management to cope with problems of executive development. "Organizational Structure and Employee Morale," *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 15, No. 2 (April, 1950), pp. 169-179.

[4] Dwight Waldo of public administration says, "Business administration and public administration grew up as allied disciplines, and their mutual borrowings, especially those of public administration from business administration, have been large. The inspiring drive of many of the Founding Fathers of public administration was the drive to apply business methods to government." *The Study of Public Administration* (Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1955), p. 56.

In the introduction to *Modern Concepts of Hospital Administration* (Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders Co., 1962), p. 5, the editor, J. K. Owen, states that the book ". . . interprets the field of hospital administration in the light of present-day management principles."

A basic hypothesis of Morris Janowitz's study of the modern professional soldier is ". . . that in order to accomplish his duties, the military commander must become interested and more skilled in techniques of organization, in the management of morale and negotiation." *The Professional Soldier* (London: Collier-Macmillan Limited, 1960), pp. 9-10.

[5] Clark Kerr, *The Uses of the University* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1963).

Universities should bring their management theory and techniques up to date just as every other growing institution in our society has done. Yet, universities have not seemed to join these other expanding institutions in analyzing their administrative activities. The following quotations give evidence to this lack of attention. A college president says:

> Too many of us still tend to draw a circle around an academic institution and say it is a community of scholars and, therefore, it should be insulated from the management practices and organization principles which sully the realms of commerce.[7]

James A. Perkins, from the Carnegie Foundation, declares:

> . . . it is a fact that the university as a social institution has received far less attention than business and government organizations.[8]

---

[6] The huge University of California complex, for example, in 1962 had the following description: ". . . operating expenditures from all sources of nearly half a billion dollars, with almost another 100 million for construction; a total employment of over 40,000 people, more than IBM and in a far greater variety of endeavors; operations in over a hundred locations, counting campuses, experiment stations, agricultural and urban extension centers, and projects abroad involving more than fifty countries; nearly 10,000 courses in its catalogues; some form of contact with nearly every industry, nearly every level of government, nearly every person in its region. Vast amounts of expensive equipment were serviced and maintained. Over 4,000 babies were born in its hospitals. It is the world's largest purveyor of white mice. It will soon have the world's largest primate colony. It will soon have 100,000 students—30,000 of them at the graduate level; yet much less than one-third of its expenditures are directly related to teaching. It already has nearly 200,000 students in extension courses—including one out of every three lawyers and one out of every six doctors in the state." *Ibid.*, pp. 7-8.

Admittedly the University of California is the "General Motors" of the academic world, but nevertheless there are about 100 universities in the United States with over 9,000 students. (Compiled from: United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, *Opening Fall Enrollment in Higher Education, 1964.*) They employ about 1,000 faculty members (The Big Ten universities, for instance, have an average of approximately 1,500 full-time faculty members. Compiled from: *American Universities and Colleges* (9th ed.), Washington: American Council on Education, 1964) and also require an extensive amount of supporting activities. (For example, large universities undertake the major share of research conducted in the nation's educational institutions which will amount to more than 1.5 billion dollars during the current academic year. *The Wall Street Journal*, December 28, 1964, p. 1.)

[7] Donald C. Stone, "What Modifications in the Management of Institutions of Higher Education Will Be Necessary for More Effective Operation?" *Current Issues in Higher Education*, Washington: Association for Higher Education, 1957, p. 193.

[8] James A. Perkins, "The Campus—Forgotten Field of Study," *Public Administration Review*, Vol. 20, No. 1 (Winter, 1960), p. 1.

The President of the American Association of Education advocated it was high time the university be

> . . . subjected to the same intensive analysis and study which have been brought to bear on various forms of business and industrial enterprise.[9]

John J. Corson, a director of McKinsey and Company, a management consulting firm, reports:

> Analysis of the functioning of business enterprises and governmental units has become commonplace and generally inclusive in character. The college or university as a functioning organism has less frequently been subjected to analysis, and then not often in terms of its total operations.[10]

In a paper on needed research in universities, an expert from higher education states:

> So little research has been done on how colleges and universities are organized and administered that it is fair to say, in fact, that the field has not been touched.[11]

These quotations are representative of the general consensus of university administrators, experts in the field of higher education, and people from business management and organization theory. All agree that today's university is a fertile area for administrative research. An extended background should be presented in order to clear up some of this confusion and thus put the study of academic administration into its proper perspective.

THE USE OF MANAGEMENT CONCEPTS IN THE ANALYSIS OF ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATION

The university is generally divided into four major areas of administrative activity: 1) academic administration; 2) student services; 3) business management, including fiscal management; and 4) development and public relations.[12] Universities have devoted a great deal of attention to student services,[13] business management,[14] and public relations.[15] Highly trained specialists perform these functions. Academic administration, on the other hand, has not received such attention. As an institutional researcher has concluded, "The study of academic administration is an almost unexplored area in the research on higher education."[16]

---

[9] Logan Wilson, "A President's Perspective," in *Faculty-Administrative Relationships.* A report of a work conference sponsored by the Commission on Instruction and Evaluation of the American Council on Education, May 7-9, 1957.

[10] John J. Corson, *Governance of Colleges and Universities* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1960), p. 4.

[11] T. R. McConnell, "Needed Research in College and University Organization and Administration," *The Study of Academic Administration,* ed. Terry F. Lunsford (Boulder, Colorado: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1963), p. 113.

[12] United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, *Internal Structure, Bulletin 1962, No. 9,* prepared by Archie R. Ayers and John H. Russel, Washington, pp. 9-10.

Academic administration is primarily concerned with the organization, administration, and control of faculty personnel. In an investigation of this area, one must turn to the work done in general management and organization theory for a framework of analysis. This does not necessarily assume that the management knowledge applicable to business organizations and largely adopted by government, hospitals, and the military are also directly applicable to institutions of higher learning. However, the conceptual framework used to organize general management knowledge provides a good point of departure. The assumption is the universality of the management process.

A universal management process

The literature in this area is replete with arguments concerning the general applicability of management concepts to university academic administration. The cases for and against, however, are not always clear. Part of the problem is properly defining the terms involved. "The term 'management,'" warns a dean in liberal arts, "is one which is unwise to use on the campus."[17] In another instance a dean from a large university declared, "The word 'management,' with its heavy connotative freight of efficiency and good order, applies dubiously, if at all, to academic administration."[18] If management is associated with bureaucracy, efficiency, budgets, paper work, and red tape, obvious difficulties arise. A clarification of what is meant by management seems necessary.

---

[13] Student services administration includes the provision for students for counseling and guidance; extracurricular activities—clubs, intramural sports, student government, financial aids, health services; housing and boarding; and placement, both full-time and part-time. *Ibid.*, p. 13.

[14] This area includes financial reporting, budget preparation and control, receipt, administration, and custody of all funds; purchasing; internal auditing; contracts; payrolls; the investment of funds; the business management of auxiliary enterprises; the construction, maintenance, and operation of physical facilities and the administration of nonacademic personnel. *Ibid.*, p. 14.

[15] Administration of this area encompasses: development, fund raising, public affairs, community services, publicity, information services, press relations, alumni activities, institutional publications, mailing services, radio and television activities, staff relations with the public, student off-campus programs, student recruitment, and relations with the state legislature. *Ibid.*, p. 15

[16] Robert H. Kroepsch, Preface, *The Study of Academic Administration, op. cit.*, p. v.

[17] Marten Ten Hoor, "Personnel Problems in Academic Administration," *Liberal Education*, Vol. XLV, No. 3 (October, 1959), p. 413.

[18] Harland Cleveland, "The Dean's Dilemma: Leadership of Equals," *Public Administration Review*, Vol. 20, No. 4 (Winter, 1960), p. 23.

The management process is a universal concept of all organized activity. In *all* organizations, decisions are made, communicated, and hopefully controlled. This process occurs in General Motors, the Catholic Church, the Department of Agriculture, SAC Headquarters, General Hospital, The University of Iowa, and in any other organized endeavor. The process is present regardless of purpose, size, environment, personnel, or any other condition.[19] For clarity a distinction should be made between the process per se and the people who perform it. In discussions of academic administration, the term management generally refers to the people who perform rather than the process itself. In most instances, the use of management probably creates visions of those who manage business and industrial organizations. Clearly, the management process implies a much broader scope than this common usage.

The argument, therefore, does not lie in accepting or rejecting the management process. The process cannot help but be present in academic administration as long as decisions are made, communicated, and controlled. The problem, then, is not whether these management functions are performed or not, but rather *how* and *why* they are performed in a university.

The organizational character of the university

Chester I. Barnard defines an organization as a system of consciously coordinated personal activities or forces. He states, "Organization will then mean a similar thing, whether applied to a military, a religious, an academic, a manufacturing, or a fraternal cooperation, though the physical environment, the social environment, the number and kinds of persons, and the bases of their relation to the organization will be widely different."[20] Max Weber, Herbert A. Simon, and Talcott Parsons would all agree that there are certain common characteristics in all organizations.[21] Yet, despite the common elements, there are some theoretical and practical differences among various organizations. Parsons differentiates organizations according to four theoretical categories: values, adaptive patterns, operative codes, and institutional patterns.[22] Parsons would say that "The business firm is governed by the values of economic rationality; the maximization of production with minimal cost in the economic sense." The university, on the other hand, ". . . belongs quite clearly in the category of pattern-maintenance primacy. Its goal is twofold: it is part of the process of socialization or of education, and it has responsibility for creative modification of the cultural tradition through the process usually referred to as 'research.' "[23]

---

[19] The classic statement on the universality of the management function was made by Oliver Sheldon: "It is because management is the one inherent necessity in the conduct of any enterprise that it is possible to conceive of it as a profession. Whether capital be supplied by individuals or by the state, whether labor be by hand or by machine, whether the workers assume a wide control over industry or are subjected to the most autocratic power, the function of management remains constant." *The Philosophy of Management* (London: Sir Isaac Pitman and Sons, Ltd., 1923), p. 48.

[20] Chester I. Barnard, *The Functions of the Executive* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1938), pp. 72-73.

[21] Parsons says, "There is already a considerable literature on organization which cuts across disciplinary lines." Three writers have been particularly important in stimulating his thinking in the field: Max Weber, Chester I. Barnard, and Herbert Simon.

John J. Corson gives a more descriptive characterization of the university as an organization. He recognizes the following six characteristics of the modern university:

1. The university's goals are not clearly defined and are comprehensive in character; they provide no specific guiding purpose; they give great opportunity for free play to faculty members and place large demands for leadership on presidents, deans, and department heads.
2. The product or service that the university produces is less tangible than that of many other enterprises.
3. The customers, that is, the students or their prospective employers, exercise limited influence upon those who participate in making the decisions of the enterprise.
4. The faculty is made up of individuals who are highly specialized in many fields; most of them are committed intellectually and careerwise to a discipline or profession rather than to the employing university.
5. Like professionals in other enterprises, they expect the right of self-direction in their work, and the opportunity to participate in decisions that generally affect the conditions under which they work.
6. The right to participate in the making of decisions is diffused among a greater proportion of the participants in the enterprise than is typical of other forms of organization.[24]

Loosely applied, this description constitutes the general context within which the university's management process must function.

Talcott Parsons, "Suggestions for a Sociological Approach to the Theory of Organizations—I," *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 1, No. 1 (June, 1956), p. 64.

See also: Max Weber, *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization*, Trans. A. M. Henderson and Talcott Parsons (New York: Oxford University Press, 1947), chap. iii; and Herbert A. Simon, *Administrative Behavior* (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1960).

[22] Talcott Parsons, "Suggestions for a Sociological Approach to the Theory of Organizations—II," *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 1, No. 2 (September, 1956), p. 230.

[23] *Ibid.*, pp. 230-231.

[24] Corson, *op. cit.*, pp. 141-142.

The authority structure of the university

The term "authority" is used freely in discussions of academic administration. As with the term management, authority is often misunderstood and hence frequently misused. Authority is often associated with order-giving or authoritarianism, with a resulting negative or displeasing connotation.[25]

Max Weber defines authority as ". . . the probability that certain specific commands (or all commands) from a given source will be obeyed by a group of persons."[26] The authority relationship involves the acceptance by a subordinate of a decision by a superior.[27] The authority structure involves the concepts of hierarchy and power in formal organizations. The power structure and the hierarchical structure, however, will probably be quite different.[28] In total, the concept of authority involves the sources of power which contribute to subordinate acceptance.

The authority concept applied to academic administration requires special attention. Burton Clark has stated:

> . . . academic authority is a peculiarly subtle and complex matter, a murky business that has caused highly intelligent men to veer away or throw up their hands.

Clark goes on to say that a thorough investigation of academic authority is handicapped because

> . . . every academic man is to some degree a lay expert on academic authority, through his experience in his own college and the insights of friends in other places. This sense of personal proficiency blocks rather than encourages sustained investigation, for where everyone already privately knows the score, there is little reason to probe further.[29]

A good starting point in analyzing authority in universities is the determination of authority types. Weber identifies three pure types of legitimate authority: traditional, charismatic, and legal.[30] Legal or rational authority is associated with bureaucratic organizations. The basic characteristics of bureaucratic authority are the following:

---

[25] John D. Millett says that the concept of authority is fearful to scholars. "The Job of Management," *College and University Business*, Vol. 25, No. 3 (September, 1958), p. 22.

W. H. Cowley also states, "Academic people do not like the terms authority and chain of command." "The Administration of American Colleges and Universities" in *University Administration in Practice*, Oswald Nielsen (ed.) Stanford, California: Stanford University, 1959), p. 13.

[26] Weber, *op. cit.*, p. 324.

[27] Barnard, *op. cit.*, pp. 161-184; and Simon, *op. cit.*, pp. 123-153.

[28] Melville Dalton, *Men Who Manage* (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1959), pp. 18-68.

[29] Burton R. Clark, "Faculty Authority," *American Association of University Professors Bulletin*, Vol. 47, No. 4, (December, 1961), p. 293.

[30] Weber depicts traditional authority as—"resting on an established belief in the

1. Operations are governed by a consistent system of abstract rules;
2. The organization is structured in the form of a hierarchy;
3. Operations are characterized by a high degree of specialization; and
4. Organizational activities and relationships are conducted in a highly impersonal manner.[31]

The business and government models of organization are usually considered to be largely based on this type of authority. Does bureaucratic authority also hold true for the large university? One could safely say that the student service, business, and public relations phases of university administration have become highly bureaucratized.[32] Administration of the faculty, on the other hand, would not likely be included under this bureaucratic authority concept.

Academic administration is based on the concept of authority variously termed in the literature as collegial,[33] professional,[34] or technical.[35] The professional authority concept seems to pertain to faculty administration better than does collegial or technical authority. Professional authority is not founded on a legal or rational basis but on the perceived qualities which the professional person possesses. Parsons concludes:

---

sanctity of immemorial traditions and the legitimacy of the status of those exercising authority under them"; charismatic authority as—"resting on devotion to the specific and exceptional sanctity, heroism or order revealed or ordained by him"; and rational authority is seen as—"resting on a belief in the 'legality' of patterns of normative rules and the right of those elevated to authority under such rules to issue commands." Weber, *op. cit.*, p. 328.

[31] *Ibid.*, pp. 329-330.

[32] G. Lester Anderson pointed out three specific areas which are highly bureaucratized: (1) The service units of a university. Included would be the business affairs, admissions and records, student personnel services, the libraries and public relations; (2) Research conducted in various suborganizations such as centers, institutes, or laboratories; and (3) Instruction, particularly in the first two years, e.g., foreign languages. "The Organizational Character of American Colleges and Universities," *The Study of Academic Administration, op. cit.*, pp. 6-8.

[33] See: Weber, *op. cit.*, pp. 392-407.

Anderson after a discussion of the applicability and characteristics of collegiality states, "In summary, a collegial organization need not necessarily be—in fact, it probably is not—a non-bureaucratic organization. It essentially disturbs the classical bureaucratic organization in only one respect: it substitutes group authority for a monocratic authority." *The Study of Academic Administration, op. cit.*, pp. 10-14.

[34] Peter M. Blau and W. Richard Scott, *Formal Organizations* (San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Co., 1962), pp. 244-247; Alvin W. Gouldner, *Patterns of Industrial Bureaucracy* (New York: Glencoe Free Press, 1954); Victor A. Thompson, *Modern Organization* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1961).

[35] The terms technical and professional authority are generally used interchangeably. However, some writers in the field may differentiate. See William H. Newman who defines technical authority as the recognition of one's opinion of an established expert in some particular field. *Administrative Action* (New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1951), pp. 161-162.

> Instead of a rigid hierarchy of status and authority there tends to be what is roughly, in formal status, a company of equals, an equalization of status which ignores the inevitable gradation of distinction and achievement to be found in any considerable group of technically competent persons. Perhaps the best example of this tendency, which Weber curiously enough seems to have overlooked in its bearing on this problem, is to be found in the universities of the modern Western World.[36]

The resulting bilateral authority structure (professional in faculty management and bureaucratic in the other areas of university administration) causes confusion in analyzing the university. A look at some of the similarities and differences between bureaucratic and professional authority may be helpful in clarifying the analysis. Peter M. Blau and W. Richard Scott point out some of the similarities:

> 1. Both require that decisions be governed by universalistic standards independent of any personal consideration in the particular cases handled.
> 2. Both are expected to be impersonal and detached.
> 3. Both are marked by specialized competence based on technical training and limit the official's or professional's authority to a specialized area of jurisdiction.
> 4. Both occupy an achieved rather than ascribed status, with the selection of personnel governed by such performance criteria as competence and training.[37]

These similarities are highly theoretical and do not necessarily help or hinder the practice of academic administration.

The differences, however, may result in actual conflicts and power struggles between bureaucratic and professional authority. Two major differences contribute to these problems. The first major difference stems from the basic source of power or authority. For the bureaucrat, the basic source of authority is his position or title.[38] On the other hand, the professional derives power from his personal qualities, e.g., technical expertness and competence, and not from his position. In practice these two sources may not be differentiated by those conferring power. Therefore, the bureaucrat will not derive his authority from position only. He will also gain "power" from his perceived technical competence. The same holds true for professionals given certain titles or positions in the hierarchy. Nevertheless, enough of the basic source of authority prevails to effect self-perceptions of power of the bureaucrat and the professional. This dichotomous self-perceived power may result in conflict in the university bilateral authority structure. For instance, the faculty may not confer any power to a position such as the registrar. Yet, the registrar feels he has authority of position and issues orders to the faculty accordingly. The result may be open conflict. Melville Dalton pointed out that conflict does not necessarily hurt the organization.[39] However, if the conflict impedes the attainment of the objectives of the university, then administrators should be concerned.[40]

---

[36] Weber, *op. cit.*, comment by Parsons in an extended footnote, p. 60.

[37] Blau and Scott, *op. cit.*, p. 244.

[38] Barnard, for example, discusses "authority of position" and "authority of leadership." He does not identify either as being bureaucratic or nonbureaucratic. As will be pointed out, the two cannot necessarily be distinguished in practice. Authority involves any source of power which contributes to subordinate acceptance. Nevertheless, the basic and theoretical sources of power can and should be differentiated. Barnard, *op. cit.*, pp. 173-174.

The second major difference can be traced to the basic sense of responsibility. The bureaucrat's foremost responsibility is to his organization. The professional, however, has a sense of ethics or "norm of service" toward his clientele and discipline.[41] This professional sense of responsibility may cause problems for academic administration. Motivation, for instance, must be re-examined in light of the professional's value system. An opportunity for more time to do research may be relatively more important than a raise in salary. The technical isolation which exists as a result of disciplines may also cause difficulties in the communication process. In the case of a conflict of interests, the professor who is more loyal to his discipline than he is to his employing university causes obvious problems for effective management.[42]

Many propositions are offered to solve these problems. Amitai Etzioni feels that to increase organizational effectiveness, the authority structure must be compatible with the goals of the institution. He would advocate that in a professional authority situation, the traditional line-staff relationship be reversed. "In other words, if there is a staff-line relationship at all, experts constitute the line (major authority) structure and managers, the staff."[43] Etzioni's theory applied to academic management would imply that the faculty have line authority and that administrators act in a staff capacity.

Another possible solution comes from principles of organization. A decentralized decision-making process may cope with the problems evolving from the dual authority structure. This implies that professionals are allowed to make their own decisions within the bureaucratic framework.

---

[39] Melville Dalton, *Men Who Manage* (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1959), pp. 263-264.

[40] Such a conclusion does not imply that the professional should be censured. On the contrary, if the bureaucratic system becomes an end in itself and not a means to achieve the university goals, then the bureaucrat must be censured.

[41] Blau and Scott, *op. cit.*, pp. 244-247.

[42] Barnard, *op. cit.*, p. 220. He considered organizational loyalty to be the most important single contribution required for success.

[43] Amitai Etzioni, "Authority Structure and Organizational Effectiveness," *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 4, No. 1 (June, 1959), p. 52.

Decentralized academic administration

Centralization and decentralization are relative concepts. Both are built into any structure of organization. Organizations are centralized to the extent that decision-making is retained at the upper levels of the hierarchy. They are decentralized through the delegation of decision-making from higher to lower levels of the hierarchical structure.[44]

The academic administration of universities is probably decentralized along these lines for two main reasons. First, the professional character of academic authority has caused a high degree of decentralization. An institution employing professional people tends to become highly decentralized. Peter Drucker, for instance, suggests that professionals working on group projects in industry think each member of the research team has independent responsibility clearly vested in him. Therefore, the superior would act as a coordinator rather than a line supervisor.[45] Parsons also notes, "The multiplication of technical fields, and their differentiations from each other, lead to an essential element of decentralization in the organization which must employ them."[46] He then goes on to say that this is one of the key elements in university organization structure:

> The central personnel of a university organization are its faculty, who are all highly qualified technical experts, spread over a very wide range of different subject matters. It is they who are the main operative performers of the two principal functions of the university—teaching and research.[47]

The other main reason for the high degree of academic decentralization evolves from the sheer size and diversification of most universities. The multiversity, described earlier, almost requires a high degree of decentralization. Some of the larger state universities have as many as 15 separate colleges on the same campus. These may range all the way from the school of criminology to the school of music. There is even a more significant breakdown in some of the larger colleges of the university. The college of liberal arts may have as many as 20 or 30 separate departments. The specialized colleges and departments contribute to a high degree of decentralization. This decentralized academic administration is generally not the result of management knowledge or technique but has gradually evolved from the forces exerted by the professional authority relationship and the tremendous growth and complexity experienced by most universities.[48]

---

[44] Ernest Dale gives some objective criteria for measuring the degree of decentralization in: "A Study of the Problems of Centralization and Decentralization in Relation to Private Enterprise," *The Balance Between Centralization and Decentralization in Managerial Control*, M. J. Kruisinga (ed.) Proceedings of an International Study-Conference organized by Netherlands School of Economics at Rotterdam. pp. 27-29.

[45] Peter F. Drucker, "Management and the Professional Employee," *Harvard Business Review*, Vol. 30, No. 3 (May-June, 1952), p. 86.

[46] Parsons, Vol. 1, No. 2, *op. cit.*, p. 236.

[47] *Ibid.*, p. 236.

The governing body has thus delegated academic decisions to the president; the president has delegated to the deans of the various colleges of the university; the deans, especially in the larger colleges such as liberal arts, have delegated to the department heads; and the department heads have delegated to the individual faculty members. Corson, observing the academic administrative process from the bottom up, noted the following:

> Individual faculty members usually participate in handling appointments, promotions, and tenure commitments as members of their departmental or school faculty. The effective power to appoint and to promote, in most universities rests with the subject matter departments and their chairmen. The deans review and forward to presidents, who approve and forward to trustees for their rubber stamping.[49]

Furthermore, Caplow and McGee empirically found that the recruitment of new personnel has been delegated almost exclusively to the departmental chairman and senior staff.[50]

The problem, however, may be that universities have become too decentralized or perhaps have not grasped the true meaning of decentralization. The responsibility and control of the central administration does not cease with the mere act of delegation. Decentralization always involves some degree of centralized planning and control.

Some writers in the field of university administration hypothesize that such centralized planning and control is absent from the process of academic management. Corson makes the following observations of the decentralized university:

> Decentralized organization with a consequent autonomy among its constituent units has come without the homogeneity of unified policies and purposes. . . . Academic expansion achieved decentralized structure when the organizational sinews to control decentralized units did not exist.[51]

---

[48] Corson reports, "Ever increasing diversity has created an increasing number of organizational subdivisions, i.e., departments. The history of the last hundred years in higher education is one of expanding decentralization. . . . The growth has come not from institutional leadership so much as from the need to satisfy the requirements of individual areas of teaching and scholarship and of growing professional fields." *op. cit.*, p. 85.

[49] *Ibid.*, p. 106.

[50] Theodore Caplow and Reece J. McGee, *The Academic Marketplace* (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1958), p. 186.

[51] Corson, *op. cit.*, pp. 85-86.

Moreover, large universities have seemed to develop in the opposite direction from what Philip Selznick describes as follows:

> The need for centralization declines as the homogeneity of personnel increases. A unified outlook, binding all levels of administration, will permit decentralization without damage to policy. When top leadership cannot depend on adherence to its viewpoint, formal controls are required, if only to take measures that will increase homogeneity. On the other hand, when the premises of official policy are well understood and widely accepted, centralization is more readily dispensable. Hence we shall expect that a relatively high degree of centralization will be required in the early stages of institutional development. Later, when homogeneity has been achieved, decentralization will be feasible without undue loss of control.[52]

Certainly, today's universities are anything but homogeneous. Yet, universities are highly decentralized with questionable centralized controls inherent in their academic administrative process.

The concept of control in academic administration

Included in [illegible] discussions of authority and centralization-decentralization thus far [illegible] been the concept of control. Control is defined as making sure things go according to plan. The universal applicability of control was given by Henri Fayol:

> In an undertaking, control consists in verifying whether everything occurs in conformity with the plan adopted, the instructions issued and principles established. It has for object to joint out weakness and errors in order to rectify them and prevent recurrence. It operates on everything–things, people, actions.[53]

Control becomes especially important in large decentralized organizations. In such organizations central controls are necessary to achieve some amount of coordination and a unity of purpose. Alfred Sloan recognized this importance of central control in large, decentralized industrial organizations. His plan of organization rested on not one, but two important principles:

1. The responsibility attached to the chief executive of each operation shall in no way be limited. Each such organization headed by its chief executive shall be complete in every necessary function and enabled to exercise its full initiative and logical development. (Decentralization of operations.)
2. Certain central organization functions are absolutely essential to the logical development and proper coordination of the corporation's activities. (Centralized staff services to advise the line on specialized phases of the work,

---

[52] Philip Selznick, *Leadership in Administration* (Evanston, Illinois: Row, Peterson, 1957), p. 113.

[53] Henri Fayol, *General and Industrial Management* (London: Sir Isaac Pitman & Sons, Ltd., 1949), p. 107.

> and central measurement of results to check the exercise of delegated responsibility.[54]

It has been pointed out that Sloan probably borrowed some of this philosophy from the Roman Catholic Church and the military. James D. Mooney and Alan C. Reiley, in their classic *Principles of Organization*, brought out the importance central controls play in these two organizations. In discussing military organization they stated:

> The military principle of decentralized operations does not exclude coordinated action for a common purpose. On the contrary, it derives from this principle and rests upon it. Without such unity of plan and purpose, decentralized operations would be disorganizing.[55]

In the Roman Catholic Church "The central headship of this vast organization requires a central administration through which all functions are coordinated."[56] The concept thus seems applicable to all types of organizations.

Fayol's statement of the universality of control also emphasized control over organizational participants. In fact, effective personnel controls may be the most important requirement for organizational success. Such controls do not imply strict bureaucratic standards such as those found in the budgeting process but rather are based on effective personnel policies and practices. Peter Drucker declares:

> Employment selection and promotion decisions are the real controls. In the employment selection an institution decides what kind of people it wants altogether. In the promotion decisions it makes operational its true and actual values and its real performance standards.[57]

Confusion, decreased morale, and damage to the attainment of the university's purpose[58] may result when administration tells the faculty that its main job is to do research but then promotes men who do not perform accordingly. Drucker emphasizes this as follows:

> A system of controls which is not in conformity with this true, this only effective, this ultimate control of the organization which lies in its people-decisions, will, therefore, at best, be ineffectual—as most are. At worst it will cause never-ending conflict and will push the organization out of control.[59]

---

[54] Dale, *op. cit.*, p. 41.

[55] James D. Mooney and Alan C. Reiley, *The Principles of Organization* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1939), p. 134.

[56] *Ibid.*, p. 105.

[57] Peter F. Drucker, "Controls, Control and Management," *Management Controls* (eds.) Charles P. Bonini, Robert K. Jaedicke and Harvey M. Wagner (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1964), p. 295.

[58] The university *as a whole* must have a purpose or definitionally it would not exist. Barnard, *op. cit.*, p. 82.

[59] Drucker, *op. cit.*, p. 295.

Yet, some writers in higher education feel that administrative control of the faculties of large universities cannot and should not be attempted. The argument is usually based upon the highly specialized nature of each faculty member and the resulting inability of university administrators to appoint and promote them. Typical of this line of thought would be the following comment from an *AAUP Journal* article:

> Academic administration is not designed to judge the quality of academic personnel. Since a university is a community of scholars, entrance into it and promotion within it should be a responsibility assumed and a power exercised by the community. What is asked for here is a judgment by peers mostly because of the impossibility of a judgment by anyone else. No one is competent to judge a scholar's academic accomplishments except scholars in his own field; with them he can be most sure of a fair appraisal on his academic merits. Academic employment then should be a function of the faculty.[60]

Others recognize the problems involved in selecting and evaluating faculty personnel but, nevertheless, see the necessity for central administrative control. Logan Wilson, noted author and university administrator, states:

> Ideally, of course, an academic community of teachers, scholars, and scientists is a body of equals in all important respects. Actually this is never the case. It is doubtful that any other working community of comparable size in our society represents a wider variety in knowledge, ability and skills, or, in most of its parts, a higher order of them. Somehow or other these have to be centrally evaluated and furthered in terms of the institutions' basic endeavors.[61]

Harold W. Dodds, author and former president of Princeton University, states:

> Although in the great majority of the scores or hundreds of cases treated each year in a university the president perforce merely transmits as his own the judgments of others, he remains technically and morally accountable for all appointments and promotions. . . . Unfortunately, not all presidents take this responsibility seriously enough.[62]

A model of executive control

The concepts of major and executive control may be helpful in analyzing academic administrative control. In industrial organizations, Sloan viewed major control as a line of authority running from the stockholders to the directors to two major committees chosen by the directors. Executive control, on the other hand, was to rest with the president, who would act within the framework laid down by major control. Under him would be the operations.[63] The analogy of the university faculty serving as major control and the administration considered as executive control could be made. In terms of academic administration, this would imply that the faculty participate in or even dictate central personnel policy. However, executive control would be dependent on central administration to see this policy carried out in practice.

---

[60] James Cavanaugh, "Academic Administration: Its Place in the Sun," *American Association of University Professors Bulletin*, Vol. 43, No. 4 (Winter, 1957), p. 632.

[61] Logan Wilson, "Academic Administration: Its Abuses and Uses," *American Association of University Professors Bulletin*, Vol. 41, No. 4 (Winter, 1955), p. 691.

[62] Harold W. Dodds, *The Academic President—Educator or Caretaker?* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1962), p. 124.

A model of executive control in academic personnel administration could be briefly stated as follows:

1. The faculty members formulate and translate the goals of the university into a promotion policy. This policy becomes the norm for the following:
    a. Faculty performance,
    b. Decentral policies,
    c. Promotion practices, and
    d. Control decisions.
2. The promotion policies should be understood by all the participants in the university. To achieve this understanding, there must be effective forward communication.
3. Finally, effective feedback communication should be utilized. If feedback indicates the university standards are not in accord with performance, then an executive control decision must be made. Such control decisions may infer two types of action:
    a. The decision may be made to re-examine the present standards.
    b. Organizational sanctions, such as nonpromotion, may be applied to maintain present standards.

This three-step framework structured the analysis and served as a point of departure in drawing conclusions and implications for the study.

The next chapter reviews the relevant literature in academic administration. Chapter III presents the specific problem and the method of research for the study. Chapter IV, the description of the specified universities' promotion policies and practices, serves as preliminary investigation for the major analysis. This major analysis is presented in Chapter V, which is concerned with central control of faculty promotions. Finally, Chapter VI presents the conclusions and implications of the study.

---

[63] Ernest Dale, "Contributions to Administration by Alfred Sloan, Jr., and GM," *op. cit.*, p. 42.

Chapter II

Some Contributions to the Study of Academic Administration

In making an extensive search of the literature, the author uncovered a negligible amount of work which could be classified as a systematic theory or precise empirical study of the management of universities. This does not imply that nothing has been written on the topic of university administration.[1] Many publications dealing with university administration and various related topics are found in the literature but, with very few exceptions, nothing approaches a *systematic analysis* of the management of universities.

MINOR CONTRIBUTIONS OF NOTED WRITERS FROM OTHER FIELDS

Adam Smith,[2] Charles H. Cooley,[3] Thorstein Veblen,[4] Morris L. Cooke,[5] and Upton Sinclair,[6] pioneers in their respective fields, and more contemporary writers from sociology and business administration such as Talcott Parsons,[7] David Riesman,[8] and Dale Yoder[9] have touched on academic administration. The literary attempts of these men have mainly consisted of either taking "potshots" at university administration or having their main interests spill over into the area of university administration. Adam Smith made the following observations of faculty autonomy:

---

[1] The literature almost never makes a distinction between the various types of university administration, i.e., academic business, student services, and public relations. Writers in the field generally use university administration interchangeably with academic administration and specify the other phases of administrative activity. In this discussion of the literature search, university administration and academic administration is also used interchangeably.

[2] Adam Smith, *The Wealth of Nations*, 1776 (London: Methuen and Co., Ltd., 1904), Vol. I, pp. 133-136, and Vol. II, pp. 249-253.

[3] Charles H. Cooley, *Life and the Student: Roadside Notes on Human Nature, Society and Letters* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1931).

[4] Thorstein Veblen, *The Higher Learning in America* (New York: B. W. Huebsch, 1918).

[5] Morris L. Cooke, *Academic and Industrial Efficiency* (New York: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, Bulletin No. 5, 1910).

[6] Upton Sinclair, *The Goose-Step, A Study of American Education* (Pasadena, California: Published by the author, 1922).

[7] Talcott Parsons, "Suggestions for a Sociological Approach to the Theory of Organizations—I and II" *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 1, No. 1 and No. 2

> If the authority to which he (the professor) is subject resides in the body corporate, the college, or university, of which he himself is a member, and in which the greater part of the other members are, like himself, persons who either are, or ought to be teachers; they are likely to make a common cause, to be all very indulgent to one another, and every man to consent that his neighbor may neglect his duty, provided he himself is allowed to neglect his own.

He had stronger feelings about authoritative administration:

> If the authority to which he is subject resides not so much in the body corporate of which he is a member, as in some extraneous persons . . . it is not indeed in this case very likely that he will be suffered to neglect his duty altogether. All that such superiors, however, can force him to do, is to . . . give a certain number of lectures in the week or in the year. What those lectures shall be, must still depend upon the diligence of the teacher; and that diligence is likely to be proportioned to the motives which he has for exerting it. An extraneous jurisdiction of this kind, besides, is liable to be exercised both ignorantly and capriciously. In its nature it is arbitrary and discretionary, and the persons who exercise it, neither attending upon the lectures of the teacher themselves, nor perhaps understanding the sciences which it is his business to teach, are seldom capable of exercising it with judgment.[10]

Thorstein Veblen's book, *The Higher Learning in America*, published in 1918, is the classic criticism of American higher education. In his candid discussion of academic administration, he calls university administrators "captains of erudition."[11] He deplored the businesslike manner in which educational institutions were being run in his day. One cannot help but

---

(June and September, 1956), pp. 63-85 and pp. 225-239.

[8] David Riesman, *Constraint and Variety in American Education* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1958); and David Riesman, "Planning in Higher Education: Some Notes on Patterns and Problems," *Human Organization*, Vol. 18, No. 1 (Spring, 1959), pp. 12-17.

[9] Dale Yoder, "The Faculty Role in University Governance," *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 5, No. 3 (December, 1962), pp. 222-229.

[10] Smith, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, pp. 133-136, and Vol. II, pp. 249-253.

[11] Veblen states, "Men dilate on the high necessity of a businesslike organization and control of the university, its equipment, personnel and routine. What is had in mind in this insistence on an efficient system is that these corporations of learning shall set their affairs in order after the pattern of a well-conducted business concern. In this view the university is conceived as a business house dealing in interchangeable knowledge, placed under the governing hand of a captain of erudition, whose office it is to turn the means in hand to account in the largest feasible output," *op. cit.*, p. 85.

wonder what kind of comments Veblen would have about the modern multiversity.

Upton Sinclair also had some outspoken observations of higher education. The purpose of his book, *The Goose-Step,* was to show that "Our educational system is not a public service, but an instrument of special privilege; its purpose is not to further the welfare of mankind, but merely to keep America capitalistic."[12] His description of Columbia University reflects his feelings toward universities and their administrations. "The great institution was a hollow shell, a body without a soul, a mass of brick and stone held together by red tape."[13]

Morris L. Cooke utilized the principles of "scientific management" to analyze universities in the early 1900's. He made the following observation concerning the general applicability and use of industrial scientific management in universities:

> . . . the writer is convinced that there are very few, if any, of the broader principles of management which obtain generally in the industrial and commercial world which are not, more or less, applicable in the college field, and as far as was discovered, no one of them is now generally observed. At nearly every institution progress has been made along certain lines, but generally it has been a "lone fight"; one institution doing one thing and another doing another, without any of the mutual help and cooperation which is given in the business world.[14]

He also had some comments to make concerning the solidarity of the university:

> The autonomy of the departments has led to the absence of much real solidarity in our colleges and universities. One gets the idea from the solidarity which is apparent when it comes to athletics that this same spirit pervades all phases of the work. Unfortunately this is not true. Departmental solidarity there is, but it is being maintained very largely at the expense of the solidarity of the institution as a whole.[15]

Dale Yoder, noted in the field of business personnel management, gives a faculty member's diagnosis and treatment of the ills of university administration. He diagnoses the ills as "organizational pip—a low grade, recurring, unhappy discomfort, endemic in all working organizations of free workers, and about the same order of seriousness as the common cold."[16] The prescription for this sickness includes ". . . continuing faculty reviews of and consensus on collegiate missions, strengthening the commitments of individual faculty members, improving internal communications, and revising the occupational description for academic administrators."[17]

---

[12] Sinclair, *op. cit.*, p. 18.
[13] *Ibid.*, p. 15.
[14] Cooke, *op. cit.*, p. 7.
[15] *Ibid.*, p. 13.
[16] Yoder, *op. cit.*, p. 223.

Cooley, Riesman, and Parsons are more concerned with the sociological implications of the university. However, they also indirectly relate their analysis to academic administration. Cooley makes this comment about faculty selection:

> It is strange that we have so few men of genius on our faculties; we are always trying to get them. Of course, they must have undergone the regular academic training (say ten years in graduate study and subordinate positions) and be gentlemanly, dependable, pleasant to live with, and not apt to make trouble by urging eccentric ideas.[18]

Riesman, in placing the American higher educational system in its cultural context, also indirectly touches on some of the problems facing academic administration. While discussing faculty loyalty to the university, he states, "There is a selfless and in many ways admirable loyalty to the institution and to the group of colleagues who momentarily compose it." This loyalty, however, requires in return from the university ". . . that it rate, that people know of it and think well of it."[19]

Parson's interest in universities has been mainly confined to the use of the university as an example in demonstrating theoretical principles of organization. In the first chapter he was quoted several times concerning the universality of organizations, the differentiation between types of organizations, and the authority structure of organizations. He uses the university as one of several types of organizations to develop his theories, but he never devotes an entire effort to the university as a social organization.[20]

THE QUANTITY OF LITERATURE ON UNIVERSITY ADMINISTRATION

The sizable literature on the administration of higher education could be classified into three general categories:

1. Books and articles, written by present and former university administrators, covering all aspects of university administration but in a very general and normative manner;[21]

---

[17] *Ibid.*, p. 229.

[18] Cooley, *op. cit.*, pp. 184-185.

[19] Riesman, *Constraint and Variety*, *op. cit.*, p. 43.

[20] Parsons, *op. cit.*, and Max Weber, *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization*, trans. A. M. Henderson and Talcott Parsons. Edited with an introduction by Talcott Parsons (New York: Oxford University Press, 1947).

[21] For example see: Frank L. McVey and Raymond M. Hughes, *Problems of College*

2. Textbook prescriptions of university administration which are primarily concerned with university business administration, e.g., budgeting and financing, as opposed to academic administration;[22] and
3. Limited distribution statistical surveys on subjects such as faculty compensation, length of appointments and average ages of the various faculty ranks but with no analysis of the results.[23]

An annotated bibliography compiled by the United States Office of Education gives an indication of the tremendous quantity of literature found in these three categories. From a conservative estimate of 10,000 published items on the administration of higher education during the 1950's, the annotated bibliography has listed 2,708.[24]

Table 2-1 gives the backgrounds of the major contributors to this extensive literature. It shows that practically all the authors in the area are either practicing administrators or specialists in the field of higher education. With the exception of Ordway Tead, who was with a publishing firm when the data were gathered, but who has done work in general administration,[25] and Seymour Harris, a Harvard economist, who is mainly concerned with the financing of higher education,[26] no others from the academic fields of business administration or the behavioral sciences have rated as major contributors to the literature on university administration.

THE QUALITY OF LITERATURE ON UNIVERSITY ADMINISTRATION

Although the previous section points to the great quantity of literature

---

and University Administration (Ames, Iowa: Iowa State College Press, 1952); James L. Morrill, *The Ongoing State University* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1960); Harold W. Stoke, *The American College President* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1959); Lloyd S. Woodburne, *Principles of College and University Administration* (Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1958).

[22] For instance see: Thomas E. Glaze, *Business Administration for Colleges and Universities* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1962); Oswald Nielsen (ed.), *University Administration in Practice* (Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1959).

[23] Examples are: Herbert E. Longnecker, *University Faculty Compensation Policies and Practices in the United States*, Published for the Association of American Universities by the University of Illinois Press, 1956; H. K. Newburn, *Faculty Personnel Policies In State Universities.* Multilithed for limited distribution at Montana State University, 1959; J. F. Wellemeyer, Jr. (ed.), *Compensation on the Campus* (Washington: Association for Higher Education, 1961).

[24] Walter C. Eells and Ernest V. Hollis, *Administration of Higher Education: An Annotated Bibliography*, Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1960.

[25] Ordway Tead, *Administration: Its Purposes and Performance* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1959); Ordway Tead, *The Art of Administration* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1951).

[26] Seymour E. Harris, *How Shall We Pay For Education* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1948); Seymour E. Harris, *Higher Education: Resources and Finance* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1962).

Table 2-1

Backgrounds of the Major Contributors to the Literature on University Administration

Type of employment held by major authors in university administration	*Number of authors who have written six or more publications in university administration between 1950-1960*
President of a college or university	10
Employed by an educational association	9
Professor of education	8
Employed in institutional research	5
Employed by United States Office of Education	5
Dean or vice-president of a college or university	4
Other	6
Total	47

Compiled from: M. M. Chambers, "Who Writes About College and University Administration?" *School and Society*, Vol. 88, No. 2181 (November 19, 1960), pp. 444-445.

in university administration, only a very few books and articles represent a thorough, systematic analysis of academic administration. These few important publications are reviewed below.

Sociologists' contributions to academic administration

Table 2-1 pointed out the scarcity of literature evolving from the behavioral sciences. Nevertheless, two of the most important studies on academic administration have come from sociologists.

The Academic Man by Logan Wilson was probably the first major contribution.[27] The author was a professor of sociology when he wrote the book, but later he became president of the University of Texas and president of the American Association of Education. Although the book was undertaken as the study of a profession, many insights into academic administration are evident. Wilson stated his purpose as the following:

> . . . to bring together related material from a wide variety of sources, systematize it according to a logical scheme, and present an ordered view of the complex roles and processes in which the academician participates. This study is neither a historical treatise nor a cross-sectional investigation of any particular university. Rather, it is a description and analysis of behavior patterns found in almost all leading American universities today.[28]

Since the book is quite old, many of Wilson's observations and conclusions are no longer applicable to today's university.[29] Yet, the study has value in terms of understanding the personnel with which academic administration must deal. For example, the following passage shows some insights into academic status and prestige:

---

[27] Logan Wilson, *The Academic Man* (London: Oxford University Press, 1942).
[28] *Ibid.*, p. 5.

> Regardless of whether the academic man is in a major or a minor university, his need for security as well as his institutionally induced ego demands provide the push from within and the pull from without toward socially valued norms. Lip service is given to the impersonal and unselfish advancement of learning, but at the same time, keen personal competition is fostered. . . . In brief, the scholar-scientist is competing against all others in his immediate field for status in the wider arena, and also for status among his local colleagues to gain their acclaim and to secure administrative recognition.[30]

The other sociological contribution comes from Theodore Caplow and Reece McGee in a study titled *The Academic Marketplace*.[31] Using faculty mobility as a starting point, the authors give an empirically based, intensive analysis of the working parts of academia. The subtleties and informal structure of academic administration are vividly presented. The following passage is representative of what Caplow and McGee found in the academic administration of today's university:

> Academic rank is conferred by the university, but disciplinary prestige is awarded by outsiders, and its attainment is not subject to the local institution's control. . . . The solution to this dilemma which has evolved in the American university is to let power lodge pretty much where it may. The fundamental device by which stresses in the university are resolved is a kind of lawlessness, consisting of vague and incomplete rules and ambiguous and uncodified procedures. . . . Being defined loosely, authority is allowed to roll free and is taken into whatever hands are capable of exercising it.[32]

An interesting analogy could be made between *The Academic Marketplace* and Melville Dalton's *Men Who Manage*.[33] Both studies are intensive case analyses of the informal workings of formal organizations. Specific topics such as informal communication, power struggles, line-staff conflicts, and the informalities of the promotion system are found in both business and academic organizations. Moreover, many hypotheses evolve from both studies for the development of better general administrative theories and practices.[34] This analogy once again points to the mutual benefits which could be derived from comparative organizational studies.

---

[29] Logan Wilson, "The Academic Man Revisited," *Studies of College Faculty*. Berkeley, California: The Center for the Study of Higher Education, December, 1961, pp. 1-11.

[30] Wilson, *Academic Man, op. cit.*, p. 172.

[31] Caplow, *op. cit.*

[32] *Ibid.*, pp. 206-207.

[33] Melville Dalton, *Men Who Manage* (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1959).

[34] Some of these hypotheses will be developed and tested in this study.

The contribution of a management consultant

From a management viewpoint, probably the most comprehensive analysis of today's university is John J. Corson's *Governance of Colleges and Universities.*[35] Corson, a management consultant while writing the book, analyzes the nature and significance of "governance."[36] His study was based upon a sample of ten colleges and universities. "The author has tried to look at these institutions with an appreciation of their function and their environment and to subject them to the kind of appraisal that as a professional management consultant (as well as a several-time educator) he applies to clients in business and government."[37]

Lamenting on the lack of "intensive analysis" in university administration, he cautions that future research in the area must recognize the unique aspects of academic administration and the reasons for this uniqueness:

> It cannot conclude with unhelpful pontifications that governing boards should deal "with major matters and not with trivia," that "sound forward planning is essential," and that "effective and efficient internal management of a university's affairs" depends upon the existence of "sound organization." And, hence, answers are needed about the how and the why of the administrative process of a college or university. The administration of any human enterprise—be it military, religious, business, governmental, or educational enterprise—consists, as other students have demonstrated, of discernible, interrelated activities.[38]

From this viewpoint Corson analyzes the roles of the various participants in the university and the administrative process occurring in today's institutions of higher learning. The following passage is representative of his analysis:

> The expanding size of institutions has forced the same delegation of authority to subordinate officers as has characterized the evolution of commercial and industrial organizations. Much authority has been delegated to the president in practically all institutions, and as the size of the institution increases, the delegation to administrative officers and to deans and departmental chairmen tends to be greater. Yet there is little evidence that a carefully thought-out design underlies the delegation pattern that obtains. Rather, prevailing organizational arrangements suggest that the existing patterns of delegated authority have been established to meet specific situations in particular institutions or to reflect the strengths and weaknesses of individuals in various echelons.[39]

---

[35] John J. Corson, *Governance of Colleges and Universities* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1960).

[36] Corson applies the term governance to "that administrative process which in the university or college is distinctive, the process of deciding and of seeing to it that the decisions made are executed." *Ibid.*, p. 12.

[37] *Ibid.*, p. vi.

[38] *Ibid.*, p. 120.

[39] *Ibid.*, p. 45.

With very few possible exceptions,[40] Corson's work is the only extensive analysis of academic administration made by a member of the discipline of management or general administration.

Contributions to the literature by administrators and specialists in higher education

Table 2-1 illustrated that practicing administrators and specialists in higher education are the main contributors to the literature on university administration. Of this wealth of material only a few were felt to be worthy of special mention.

The Academic President—Educator or Caretaker? by Harold W. Dodds, is the result of impressions gained from field work involving visits to about sixty colleges and universities and reflections from a successful presidential reign in one of America's outstanding universities.[41] President Emeritus Dodds discusses the role of the president in relation to academic leadership, the art of administration, the faculty and trustees, and in planning and budgeting. The discussion on the art of administration is particularly relevant to the central administration's role in academic administration. He declares:

> On the basis of personal experience and from observation of others we conclude that the most critical areas for the president-administrant can be reduced to three. Each is familiar, easy to express in words, but difficult for many to apply in practice. They relate to (1) the practice of consultation, (2) the principles of delegation, and (3) the structure and staffing of the administrative organization.[42]

President Emeritus Dodds often uses management principles to stress a point or to develop a line of reasoning. The following two quotations represent insights from management knowledge:

> Organizational units will be built around related functions; each will operate within a defined area of responsibility and authority under a specified chain of command, of which the administrative officers and faculty are fully in-

---

[40] The exceptions are generally confined to a few publications scattered in the literature such as those by Henry G. Hodges, "Management of Universities," *Southern Economic Journal*, Vol. 19, No. 1 (July, 1952), pp. 79-89; Dale Yoder, *op. cit.;* and Thomas Glaze, *op. cit.*

Ralph E. Balyeat, Director of the Institute of Business and Economic Relations, University of Georgia, is currently conducting an extensive study on faculty appraisal, but the results at the time of this study are unpublished.

Edward H. Litchfield, former Chancellor of the University of Pittsburgh and John D. Millett, President Emeritus of the University of Miami (Ohio) whose backgrounds are in public administration, are considered in the next section.

[41] Harold W. Dodds, *The Academic President—Educator or Caretaker?* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1962).

[42] *Ibid.*, p. 72.

> formed. No subordinate will be accountable to more than one superior, although he may serve several agencies.[43]
>
> The president is fully within his rights when he vetoes a recommended appointment and requests faculty colleagues to make a more severe appraisal of the man on the ground or to conduct a more extensive search for a better candidate from outside.[44]

Two former university administrators should also be mentioned. Edward H. Litchfield and John D. Millett have written on the subject of academic administration from backgrounds in the field of public administration.[45]

Before Dr. Litchfield became chancellor of the University of Pittsburgh, he wrote an article titled "Notes on a General Theory of Administration."[46] A proposition from this article states, "Administration and the administrative process occur in substantially the same generalized form in industrial, commercial, civil, educational, military, and hospital organizations."[47] This viewpoint has undoubtedly influenced his work in academic management.

In two articles written in 1959 Dr. Litchfield presented a penetrating analysis of academic administration.[48] He raised the following questions:

1. Do we regard the university as an organic whole?
2. Are our faculties structured to further their organic relationship?
3. Have we organized our administration in such a way as to enable them to contribute to the unification of the total institution?[49]

He believes that with the advent of large, complex universities not enough of them have developed enlightened administration. The explanation lies, "In the first place, in our failure to understand the real nature of the administrative process per se; second, in our failure to organize the administration so that it will be able to undertake its real responsibilities; and, third, in our unwillingness to train men and women for administrative roles in university organizations."[50]

---

[43] *Ibid.*, p. 81.

[44] *Ibid.*, p. 144.

[45] Millett was formerly a colonel in the U.S. Army and professor of public administration at Columbia. He later became President of Miami (Ohio) University. For his work done in public administration see: John D. Millett, *Management in the Public Service* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1954).

Litchfield was formerly Director of Civil Administration Division, Office of Military Government for Germany and Dean of the Cornell School of Business and Public Administration. He was formerly Chancellor of the University of Pittsburgh.

[46] Edward H. Litchfield, "Notes on a General Theory of Administration," *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 1, No. 1 (June, 1956).

[47] *Ibid.*, p. 28.

[48] Edward H. Litchfield, "Organization in Large American Universities—The Faculty and The Administration," *Journal of Higher Education*, Vol. 30, No. 7 and No. 9 (October and December, 1959), pp. 353-364 and pp. 489-504.

[49] *Ibid.*, pp. 353-354.

[50] *Ibid.*, p. 489.

Litchfield lists nine major shortcomings in today's university administration:

1. Inadequacy of central structure for decision-making.
2. Neglect of the problems of communication.
3. Confusion regarding control.
4. No systematic provision for reappraisal.
5. Absence of a concept of human-resources management.
6. Widespread disregard of proven management tools.
7. Rudimentary concept of the function of execution.
8. Confusion of roles within the institution.
9. Failure to train for university administration.[51]

He makes thought-provoking comments about each of these administrative shortcomings. For example, in discussing human-resources management he declares:

> Criteria for promotion are not always established, and, when they are, there is often confusion as to the relative importance of research, teaching, and professional and community service as goals toward which the individual should work. . . . We condone all of this in the name of the independence of the individual scholar. . . . I would, rather, believe that we can do infinitely more for the individual and for his institution if we are willing to adopt the concept that the total institution has an administrative responsibility for the maximum growth and utilization of its human resources.[52]

In concluding, Dr. Litchfield again emphasizes university administrators' needs for understanding the general administrative process. He declares, "In a generation which has isolated the administrative process in society and subjected it to careful appraisal, we university administrators have done little to study it, are self-conscious in our performance of it, and have been almost systematic in our neglect of the necessity of training for it."[53]

On the other hand, John D. Millett, who also has a background in the field of public administration, believes that ". . . ideas drawn from business and public administration have only a very limited applicability to colleges and universities."[54]

Although former President Millett would argue that universities ". . . are different in institutional setting, in purpose, in operation, and hence in internal organization," he would admit that ". . . an outline of administrative process has certain utility for the study of an organizational entity. . . ."[55]

---

[51] *Ibid.*, pp. 493-503.

[52] *Ibid.*, p. 499.

[53] *Ibid.*, p. 503.

[54] John D. Millett, *The Academic Community* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1962), p. 4.

[55] *Ibid.*, pp. 21 and 32.

Finally, one more publication deserves special attention. This is a collection of papers which were presented at the Fifth Annual Institute on College Self-Study held at Berkeley, California, in July, 1963.[56] The papers given by G. Lester Anderson[57] on "The Organizational Character of American Colleges and Universities," Burton R. Clark[58] on "Faculty Organization and Authority," and T. R. McConnell[59] on "Needed Research in College and University Organization and Administration" are especially relevant to the study of academic administration.

Anderson was discouraged by the literature on university administration. He termed it as ". . . largely reminiscent, anecdotal, or hortatory, and that what passed for research was largely of the normative-survey type."[60] None of this literature seemed to tie in with contemporary theory of organization or the science of administration. He then proceeded to analyze today's university in terms of contemporary organization theory. He concluded that, ". . . collegiality is but a variant of bureaucratic organization and community in an academic mythology. The basic organizational pattern is that of bureaucracy."[61]

Burton Clark also feels the traditional view of the university as a collegium needs to be re-examined in light of present-day university environment and organization structure. He analyzes the modern university in terms of 1) the social organization of the campus, and 2) the faculty organization and authority. Four trends were presented in the campus social organization: 1) unitary to composite or federal structure, 2) single to multiple value systems, 3) nonprofessional to professional work, and 4) consensus to bureaucratic coordination.[62] The faculty adapt to these social trends by what he labeled segmentation, a federated professionalism, and the growth of individual power centers.[63]

T. R. McConnell's paper is an appropriate conclusion to the discussion of the literature on academic administration. He reflects that the title of his paper should have been "*Some* Needed Research" instead of "Needed

---

[56] Terry F. Lunsford (ed.), *The Study of Academic Administration*, Boulder, Colorado: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1963.

[57] Anderson is Vice-President at the University of New York at Buffalo.

[58] B. R. Clark is a sociologist at the Center for the Study of Higher Education at Berkeley.

[59] McConnell was chairman of the institute and is also from the Center for the Study of Higher Education at Berkeley.

[60] Anderson, *The Study of Academic Administration, op. cit.*, p. 1.

[61] *Ibid.*, p. 18.

[62] Clark, *Ibid.*, pp. 39-44.

[63] *Ibid.*, pp. 44-51.

Research in University Organization and Administration." Lamenting the lack of a conceptual framework, he says:

> Furthermore, the conceptual framework does not exist, except perhaps, in the papers of this institute, either for thinking systematically about college organization and administration or for drawing a coherent set of hypotheses for investigation. Most references to higher education in books and articles on the general theory of organization are little more than casual asides. At times these references point out that colleges and universities are outside the general class of organizations found in business and government.[64]

This statement was found to be true in most of the literature. However, the preceding books and articles reviewed in this chapter do offer some significant hypotheses for future testing and analysis. As was pointed out in Chapter I, the conceptual framework does not exist per se for such an analysis. Much has to be drawn from the general body of management knowledge. Proper modification and application of this knowledge serves as the framework of analysis for this study of academic administration.

---

[64] McConnell, *Ibid.*, p. 113.

Chapter III

The Specific Problem and the Method of Research

The purpose of the two preceding chapters was to lay a basic conceptual foundation for the study of academic administration. This chapter makes the transition from the general foundation to one specific problem of academic administration—faculty promotions in rank. This problem is investigated from an essentially descriptive and analytical approach without strict methodological control.

THE PROBLEM INVESTIGATED

The strength of any institution of higher learning depends upon the excellence of its faculty. Effective management is needed to utilize full faculty potential. Inherent in faculty management is a system of rewards and penalties. Such a system is necessary to reinforce the authority concept, to maintain standards, and to motivate the personnel. In universities, faculty promotions in rank are a very important aspect of the reward-penalty system. This promotion process is the concern of this study.

To define the problem further, the framework presented in Chapter I should be briefly reviewed. Chapter I characterized the modern university as a large, complex organization. Academic administration within these "multiversities" is highly decentralized. Certain management concepts were indicated to have universal applicability. One such concept was central control of decentralized organizations. Large decentralized industrial, religious, and military organizations were shown to utilize central controls to maintain a coordinated unity of purpose. Does the large university also have central control over decentralized faculty administration? The answer and its implications is the basic purpose of this study.

Definition of terms used in the study

The meanings of the management concepts used in the study, e.g., authority, centralization, decentralization, and control, were given in Chapter I. Their meanings have universal applicability and were used in the initial investigation and in the interpretation of the results. The following definitions refer to this study only.

Central Administration for the study was comprised of two university administrators. One was the president, sometimes called the chancellor. The second one was the vice-president, who is primarily responsible for academic personnel decisions. This second administrator usually has the title of vice-president of academic affairs, provost, or dean of faculties.

Central Promotion Policy refers to ". . . a predetermined and accepted course of thought and action that is defined and established as a guide toward accepted goals and objectives."[1] Such a definition of promotion policy does not necessarily imply a detailed written policy but does require the policy to be 1) accepted, 2) defined, and 3) established. This policy should serve as the norm or standard for faculty members' performance, decentral promotion policies and practices, and central control decisions. The central policy is associated with the university as a whole rather than with one particular college or department of the university.

Central Promotion Practices mean the *actual* procedures used and the actions taken by central administration in the promotion process. In this sense, a distinction is made between policy and practice. Practice refers to what is done rather than to what is intended.[2] However, recurring practices which do not conform to established policies may themselves beoome implicit policies. Therefore, there may not always be a strict line of demarcation between policies and practices. This is pointed out by Herbert A. Simon, who says:

> In addition to these several kinds of policy [legislative, management and working], or authoritatively promulgated rules, there are to be found in almost every organization a large number of "practices" which have not been established as orders or regulations, and which are not enforced by sanctions, but which are nevertheless observed in the organization by force of customs or for other reasons. Often, the line between policy and practice is not sharp unless the organization follows the "practice" or "policy" of putting all its policies in writing.[3]

The above problem of differentiating between policies and practices is probably the case in large universities without written personnel policies.

---

[1] Dale Yoder, *Personnel Management and Industrial Relations*, 5th ed. (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1962), p. 139.

[2] Yoder, *et al.*, define practice as, "action taken, presumably to implement or carry out policy, although practice may not be appropriate or effective in implementing existing policy and may be unsatisfactory for that reason." *Handbook of Personnel Management and Labor Relations* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1958), p. 3-4.

[3] Herbert A. Simon, *Administrative Behavior*, 2nd ed. (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1960), p. 59.

Decentralized Administration refers to administrators at the college and departmental levels of large universities. For the study, two such administrators were included to represent decentralized administration. One was always the business college dean, and the other was a business department head or in the case of non-departmentalized business colleges, the associate dean.[4]

Decentral Promotion Policy is defined as an accepted, well-defined, and established norm for promotion practices within the sphere of the business college. In other words, a decentral promotion policy applies directly to the business college personnel and may be quite different from the total university promotion policy. This policy is not necessarily written but should, in a micro sense, be for that particular college only.[5]

Decentralized Promotion Practice again refers to how the promotion process actually occurs rather than to what was intended. For instance, the business college policy may state that the dean must read all faculty publications before making an evaluation. In actual practice, however, the dean may keep a bibliography of publications but not have time to read all publications. In this situation, policy and practice would be different.

Central Control is defined as central administration verifying and correcting deviations from central promotion policies. A hypothetical example of a central control decision of a decentralized promotion may help clarify the meaning:

> Central university personnel policy states that in order to be promoted to full professor, faculty members must be recognized scholars with a national reputation in their discipline. The college of business personnel policy states that teaching excellence is the overriding consideration for all promotions in the college.
>
> Dr. John Q. Academic has been an associate professor in the college of business for ten years. Dr. Academic has one publication in the university-affiliated journal with limited state-wide distribution. He has given a few speeches locally but never outside the university. Dr. Academic is perceived by his department head and college dean to be an excellent teacher.
>
> At promotion time, the department head gives Dr. Academic a strong recommendation pointing out his superior teaching ability. The dean of the college of business receives the recommendation from the department head,

---

[4] The term department head and department chairman were used interchangeably. However, there is usually a tendency to view the chairman's role as a less permanent one or carrying less responsibility and authority than would the title of department head. Furthermore, it is recognized that the associate dean may not have much authority in faculty promotions. Nevertheless, in non-departmentalized colleges it was thought that his response would be beneficial to the study.

[5] Recognized is the fact that a further breakdown into departmental policies may be feasible in some of the larger colleges such as liberal arts; but as will be pointed out in the discussion of the sample, this is not necessary for business college policies.

> reviews the college policy on promotions, and also gives a strong recommendation. The central administration of the university receives the recommendations (feedback communication), reviews Dr. Academic's qualifications, compares the qualifications with central promotion policy, and rejects the promotion of Dr. Academic on the basis of not achieving a national reputation in his discipline.

A centralized control decision has been made in this example. A deviation from central policy was discovered by central administration through feedback communication, and a control decision was made.[6]

Questions investigated in the analysis of central control

In the analysis of central control of decentralized promotions, many specific questions are considered. Preliminary to this major analysis was the investigation of present central and decentral promotion policies and practices. The major analysis of central control of decentralized promotions was dependent upon this preliminary investigation.

Questions guiding the investigation of central promotion policies and practices were the following:

1. Do universities have central promotion policies which cover the whole university?
2. What are the characteristics of the all-university promotion policies?
3. Who does central administration feel is primarily responsible for making promotion policies?
4. How are faculty members presently evaluated for promotion at the central administration level?
    a. Is a current bibliography of all faculty publications available to central administration?
    b. Are the actual publications or research reports available to be read by the central administration?
    c. Are objective teaching evaluation reports of some type available to the central administrator?
5. What are central administrators' perceptions of the relative weights applied to promotion criteria?
6. What are central administrators' perceptions of the weighted locus of promotion decision-making in the university?

---

[6] Perhaps it should be emphasized that the hypothetical example in no way intends to establish what the actual promotion policies should be at either level of the university. All that is intended is to point out that a deviation from central policy occurred and a control decision was made. The same example could have teaching and publication in opposite roles. Furthermore, the example does not try to imply that there should never be exceptions. However, where rules become the exception in actual practice, either there should be a re-examination of the rules or a tightening of control.

Questions utilized in the investigation of decentralized promotion policies and practices were the following:

1. Does the college level have its own personnel policies on promotion?
2. What are the characteristics of the decentral promotion policies?
3. Who does decentral administration feel is primarily responsible for making decentral promotion policies?
4. How are faculty members currently being evaluated at the college and departmental levels?
    a. Is a current bibliography of all faculty publications available to the college dean? Is it available to the department head?
    b. Are the actual publications or research reports available to be read?
    c. Are objective teaching evaluation reports of some type available to the college dean? Are they available to the department head?
5. What are decentral administrators' perceptions of the relative weights applied to promotion criteria?
6. What are decentral administrators' perceptions of the weighted locus of promotion decision-making in the university?

Answers to these questions set the stage for the major analysis of central control of decentralized promotions. This major analysis was broken into the following three components.

1. The role of promotion policies in the analysis of central control:
    a. Are there central promotion policies which serve as the norm or standard for decentral policies and practices?
    b. Do faculty members understand the promotion policies?
    c. Do faculty members accept the promotion policies?
    d. What effect do decentral promotion policies have on central control?
2. The role played by central control in promotion practices:
    a. Do central administrators feel they can presently make an objective evaluation of faculty members' research and teaching?
    b. Do the faculty members feel that central administrators can evaluate their research and teaching?
    c. Do decentral administrators feel they can presently make an objective evaluation of faculty members' research and teaching?
    d. Do faculty members feel that decentral administrators can evaluate their research and teaching?
    e. What are faculty members' perceptions of the weights applied to promotion criteria?
    f. What are faculty members' perceptions of the weighted locus of promotion decision-making in the university?
3. The direct exercise of central control in the promotion process:

a. How often do central administrators reject a positive recommendation from below?
b. What are the reasons for central administrators' rejection or non-rejection?
c. How often do decentral administrators reject a positive recommendation from below?
d. What are the reasons for decentral administrators' rejection or non-rejection?
e. How effective is central control of the research standards of the university?

In total, these questions and their resulting answers constituted the fundamental investigation and analysis of central control of decentralized promotions in large universities.

THE METHOD USED IN THE INVESTIGATION

In assessing needed research in academic administration, T. R. McConnell declared, "The research that most needs to be done at this time is essentially descriptive and analytical, rather than evaluative or experimental; and research on broader problems, even with relatively crude methods of investigation, is more important now than on narrower issues susceptible to greater methodological control."[7]

This study was essentially designed to comply with this type of needed research. The basic method of gathering information on promotion policies and practices was a confidential questionnaire survey of administrators and faculty members. The nature of the questions asked and the dependence upon the use of open-end and supplementary responses does not lend itself to a rigorous statistical analysis. The survey results are analyzed in terms of the management conceptual framework.

The population used in the study

A population or universe is defined as the totality of elements that have one or more characteristics in common.[8] The population for this study consisted of all universities in the United States with the following common characteristics:

1. 10,000 or more students
2. State supported

---

[7] T. R. McConnell, "Needed Research in College and University Organization and Administration," *The Study of Academic Administration* edited by Terry F. Lunsford (Boulder, Colorado: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1963), p. 115.

[8] David V. Huntsberger, *Elements of Statistical Inference* (Boston: Allyn & Bacon, Inc., 1961), p. 88.

3. College of business administration accredited by the American Association of Collegiate Schools of Business (A.A.C.S.B.)

Forty-seven universities make up this specified population. These 47 institutions represent 31 states and had an average enrollment of approximately 20,000 students and 1,000 full-time faculty members.[9]

This population was utilized in the analysis of central control of decentralized promotions for the following reasons:

1. Chapter I pointed out that large, complex universities have become commonplace in modern society. Because of this size and the professional authority relationship, they are, by necessity, highly decentralized. The 10,000 student minimum would guarantee a large decentralized university, which is the unit of analysis.
2. The state-supported requirement was used to obtain the highest degree of homogeneity possible. State universities, for example, tend to be more alike with regard to the delegation of authority by the governing board to the president than are private institutions. Furthermore, since the state university serves a variety of needs in the state, it tends to be highly complex and diversified.
3. To maintain homogeneity, a single, common college was chosen to represent decentralized administration in the specified population. The business school was chosen for two main reasons: 1) business school personnel may show a greater interest in a study of this nature and thus contribute to more reliable results, and 2) although business school personnel have different characteristics from other academic personnel in the university as a whole, they may be quite interesting to study.

   Dale Yoder brings out this point in discussing university governance, "This is a challenge of unusual interest and appeal to faculties and administrators in the business schools, for two reasons. For one, the disfunction probably strikes more frequently, and its symptoms reach something of an apogee, in our ranks. We can probably supply the best material for clinical study from our own backyards. Second, organization and administration are central problems for the school of management. Governance is thus a matter of pervasive professional interest to us."[10]

---

[9] Enrollment figures compiled from: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, *Opening Fall Enrollment in Higher Education*, 1964. Faculty employment figures compiled from: *American Universities and Colleges* (9th ed.), Washington: American Council on Education, 1964.

[10] Dale Yoder, "The Faculty Role in University Governance," *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 5, No. 3 (December, 1962), p. 225.

4. The final common characteristic of the population, A.A.C.S.B. accreditation, was based on the A.A.C.S.B. requirement of autonomy and separate organization of the school of business. This separate organization and autonomy would tend to make the college decentralized.

The typical business college in the population has about 1,500 students and 50 full-time faculty members.[11] This relative smallness, as compared to the liberal arts college of the university, would probably give the business college special administrative characteristics. The department heads, for instance, probably have less influence and the dean more influence in academic administration than would their counterparts in the liberal arts school.

The sample from the population

In order to answer the questions of the study, the author drew a stratified sample from the specified universities for intensive analysis. This stratified sample was composed of the following:

1. A census of the population's presidents and vice-presidents in charge of academic personnel was taken. This census represented the central administration stratum of the sample.
2. The second stratum representing decentral administration consisted of the following: a) a census of the deans of the schools of business in the population, and b) a systematic sample of one department head or in the case where none exists, an associate dean, from each school of business in the population.
3. The third stratum represented the faculties. Here a systematic sample of three faculty members from each school of business in the population was taken.

In total, 310 administrators and faculty made up this stratified sample.[12]

The listing for the census of central administration was obtained from the latest *Education Directory*.[13] The business school deans were taken from a 1964 listing published by A.A.C.S.B., while the names of the 44 decentral administrators and 136 faculty members were systematically selected from the catalogues of their respective universities.

---

[11] Compiled from: *American Universities and Colleges, op. cit.*

[12] Theoretically, 329 should be in the sample. However, this number was reduced because 1) some business schools had no associate dean or department heads and 2) there were numerous leaves of absence. Moreover, one university in the population was used as a pretest and was, therefore, not included in this number.

[13] U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, *Education Directory 1963-1964: Part 3, Higher Education.*

The samples of department heads and faculty members were systematically selected on the following basis:

1. All economics personnel were excluded.[14]
2. Department heads were selected to represent all areas of business administration. Department titles such as business administration, marketing, management, finance and insurance, accounting, production, and industrial relations were represented.
3. Three faculty members were selected to represent all three professorial ranks in each school of business in the population.
   a. Full professors were selected on the basis of being promoted in their present university within the past five years.[15]
   b. Associate professors were selected to represent all areas of business administration.
   c. Assistant professors were also selected to represent all areas of business administration.
4. The final basis of selection was that faculty members have the Ph.D. degree or its equivalent.[16]

The method used to obtain data for the analysis

The investigator's university, which is a member of the population, was used for pretesting. Structured interviewing was conducted on campus and was supplemented by several interviews with college administrators in the surrounding area. Preliminary questionnaires were answered and discussed with administration and faculty. Several interviewing sessions with an institutional research and higher education specialist from the pretest university were also included.

Three separate two-page confidential questionnaires were used to obtain information for the analysis. Each questionnaire was designed to answer the questions developed by the study for the central administration level, the decentral administration level, and the faculty level. The questionnaires were designed so that an analysis of central control of business school faculty promotions could be made. Although a statistical test could be made on the differences between the various promotion criteria and the positions in the promotion decision-making hierarchy, the differences are not pertinent to the analysis in this study. A statistical analysis of these differences may be useful for some future study.

---

[14] The faculty and department heads were selected with the pretense of obtaining as homogeneous a sample as possible. Some of the business colleges did not have the department of economics organized within the college but in liberal arts. Furthermore, although most business administration professors have a background in economics, the reverse may not be true. Robert A. Gordon and James E. Howell, *Higher Education for Business* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1959), Chapter 14, "The Business Faculty."

[15] This was accomplished in almost all cases by comparing a 1960 faculty personnel listing of the A.A.C.S.B. with a recent university catalogue. James Robinson (ed.) *Faculty Personnel*, 8th ed., 1960. Published for A.A.C.S.B. by South-Western Publishing Company.

[16] The D.B.A. degree was an allowable substitute. Moreover, in a few cases assistant professors or accounting professors without doctorates were by necessity included.

The study analyzed individual universities, as well as the population as a whole. A very high percentage response was required to make the intra-university analysis. In order to obtain this high percentage response, the investigator had to prepare a questionnaire which was short, but which had to yield enough information for a meaningful analysis. The resulting questionnaires contained all the questions developed by the study but still could be answered in a few minutes.

An initial letter containing the questionnaire, "A Survey of Faculty Personnel Policies and Practices," and an enclosed, self-addressed stamped envelope were mailed on November 15, 1964. Two weeks later, a follow-up letter, with a questionnaire and a stamped envelope enclosed, were sent to non-respondents. On December 6, 1964, a personally typed third letter, containing a questionnaire and a stamped envelope, were sent to the non-responding population of presidents, academic vice-presidents, and business school deans. Most university promotions are made during the spring or summer months. By timing the data collection, therefore, the investigator tried to reduce the bias which may result immediately before or after promotions are made.

A self-appraisal of the method used

In the opinion of the investigator, the presented method of research was considered to be best for making a comprehensive analysis of central control of business faculty promotions in large universities. However, an analysis of the strong and weak points of such a method should put the study into its proper perspective.

The following major advantages and disadvantages of a questionnaire survey will be discussed in terms of this study.[17] The main advantages are as follows:

1. The use of mailed questionnaires allows wide geographical coverage and reaches a much larger population with given funds than could be accomplished by interviews with each informant. A study of this nature required large educational institutions. Large samples covering 31 states and containing 7 participants per institution would be

---

[17] See: Mildred Parten, *Surveys, Polls, and Samples* (New York: Harper & Brothers), pp. 94-96. Her discussion was used as a guide for the self appraisal of the method used in this study.

financially infeasible on an interview basis; therefore, only a few such institutions were available. However, a wide sampling is probably necessary to make any valid conclusions concerning the topic analyzed. Hence, a questionnaire was used for the study.

2. The questions were the same for all participants in the study. By using an interview technique, the investigator could alter the questions or suggest answers to them. In order to make comparisons within and between universities, the investigator used standardized questions.
3. University administrators and faculty are busy people. Arranging interviews could be difficult. However, a short questionnaire can be answered at the convenience of the respondent.

The main limitations of the questionnaire method of research are the following:

1. The questionnaire response and actual behavior may be quite different. The nature of some questions of this study were particularly vulnerable to this limitation. However, by asking certain questions of all three stratified levels of the university and by using open-end questions and comments, one may gain some insights into the questionnaire response versus actual behavior difficulties.
2. Those returning the questionnaire may not be representative of the population or sample. This limitation can be overcome by a high percentage return. A census was taken of the central administrators and the college deans. A high percentage return would have eliminated problems of interference at this level. Correct sampling procedures and a high percentage return from the department heads and faculties would also have eliminated the problem from this level. A high percentage return was strived for by pretesting a well-designed, short questionnaire, and by sending follow-ups to non-respondents.
3. The respondent may misinterpret questions, omit essential items, or send in material which cannot be put in form for tabulation. This limitation is sometimes difficult to overcome. However, misinterpretation and omission was held to a minimum by extensive pretesting and follow-ups for omitted answers.
4. An up-to-date address list of participants is sometimes difficult to obtain. This limitation posed somewhat of a problem for this study. The many leaves of absence and apparent high degree of faculty mobility prevented a completely up-to-date list. This resulted in reducing the theoretical stratified sample by a small number.

In summary, the author investigated and analyzed the central administration's control of business faculty promotions. The questions in the study were concentrated in the areas of central and decentral promotion policies and practices, and central control of the promotion policies and practices. Forty-six large state universities were analyzed in order to answer these questions. A stratified sample from each university was utilized. Three strata were examined: 1) the president and dean of faculties (or equivalent); 2) the college of business dean and a department head (or associate dean); and 3) a systematically selected sample of three faculty members from each college of business. A short, confidential questionnaire was employed to obtain the data for the analysis. Pretesting and follow-ups to non-respondents were included in the method of research.

Chapter IV

Promotion Policies and Practices in Forty-Six Large State Universities

The promotion policies and practices of the population of this study are described in this chapter. The presentation is given from two viewpoints. First, the general university policies and practices on promotion are given by central administrators; second, the promotion policies and practices of the schools of business are described by their deans and department heads. The resulting central and decentral promotion policies and practices serve as preliminary investigation for the major analysis presented in the next chapter.

UNIVERSITY-WIDE PROMOTION POLICIES AND PRACTICES

Eighty-one central administrators were surveyed to obtain information for the study. Over 80 per cent of the central administrators responded. However, only 58 per cent of the total central administrators surveyed gave responses which were usable for tabulation purposes (see Table 4-1).[1] This compares to the 81 per cent usable response obtained from the total stratified sample of 310 administrators and faculty members. The relatively small usable response of the central administrators was primarily the result of the expected low return by presidents. In some cases the apparent

Table 4-1

The Responses of Central University Administrators to a Survey of Faculty Promotion Policies and Practices

Central administrators	*Total number in the sample*	*Number of usable responses*	*Per cent usable responses*
Presidents	40	15	38
Vice-presidents	41	32	78
Total	81	47	58

---

[1] These usable respondents represent 40 universities or 87 per cent of the specified population.

work load of the presidents resulted in passing the questionnaire to administrative assistants. The following comment indicates this action:

> Enclosed is a questionnaire which you forwarded to [the President] under date of November 16. He is currently out of town and will be unable to complete the questionnaire within the time desired. I hope that my reply will be an acceptable substitute.

These responses by administrative assistants were not counted in the study.[2] In other cases the presidents noted that one such questionnaire had been completed by the vice-president. Such responses were not double counted. Only questionnaires actually filled out and returned by the central administrator surveyed were used for tabulation and analysis. Finally, a few universities were undergoing personnel policy changes. As a result of these changes, one central administrator stated:

> I have received your inquiry of November 16 regarding faculty personnel policies and practices. At this time, however, it is impossible to respond accurately to your questionnaire because of various changes taking place within the University. Until these changes are completed, any information supplied would be erroneous and self-defeating so far as your study is concerned.

The usable responses generally were carefully filled out and supplemented by constructive and interesting comments.

Central promotion policies

Only five administrators, representing four universities, indicated there were no promotion policies at the central level. The other 90 per cent of the respondents reportedly had promotion policies covering the whole university.[3]

Promotion policies were defined as standards or norms and can be derived from many sources. Formal written policy is generally drawn up and voted upon by administration and faculty. Some comments concerning the development of formal promotion policies were the following:

> Our criteria for promotion are adopted by the university Board of Trustees—but the criteria were, in turn, formulated by a committee of the Faculty Senate, approved by the Senate, and transmitted by them to the Trustees with a recommendation that they be adopted.

> Our plan was developed by a standing committee of the Faculty Senate, ap-

---

[2] Some questionnaires returned may have been filled out by assistants. However, the top of each questionnaire emphasized that "It is extremely important that you personally answer this questionnaire."

[3] These respondents reporting a central policy represent 37 universities. Therefore, 90 per cent of the universities responding had a central policy on promotion.

> proved by the Senate and subsequently by the President and the Board of Regents.

Unwritten policy, on the other hand, is generally created by default and maintained by habit or tradition.

Central administrators viewed themselves and the faculties as being equally responsible for formulating promotion policies at the central level. Forty per cent considered themselves as primarily responsible, while another 40 per cent felt the faculty members were major contributors to central promotion policies. The remaining 20 per cent indicated the college deans and department heads were principal contributors to all-university promotion policies.

Written promotion policies. The survey results show that characteristics of the central policies vary from one university to another (see Table 4-2). Only half the universities' central administrators described policies which have the promotion criteria spelled out and known by everyone. The following passages taken from faculty handbooks are typical of written policies:

> The period of time in a given rank is ordinarily not less than three to five years. Advancement in rank is not automatic, nor may it be regarded as guaranteed upon completion of a given term of service. Demonstrated merit, not years of service, is the guiding factor. The following criteria, in addition to acceptable professional training and acceptable personality and character traits, are used in evaluating the qualifications of a member of the teaching faculty for possible advancement in rank or increase in salary:
> Teaching effectiveness
> Research, creative scholarship, or professional achievement
> Services to the University and to the public
> An attitude of cooperation in advancing the total program of the University.

Table 4-2

The Characteristics of University-Wide Promotion Policies
as Described by Central Administrators

The characteristics of the promotion policy	*Universities reporting promotion policies*	
	Number	*Percentage*
Policy is not written and probably varies from case to case.	11	30
Policy has no written criteria but is implicitly understood by a majority of the faculty.	7	19
Policy promotion criteria are spelled out and known by everyone.	19	51
Total	37	100

> In addition to the professional preparation and ability standards that define each rank, other criteria also affect promotion; teaching ability; research ability; scholarship; character and personality; academic responsibility; professional development; and service to the Commonwealth, the community, and the University.

Atypical are the detailed explanations of promotion criteria. The following passage taken from an extensive nine-page "Statement of Policy on Appointments and Promotions" seems to be the exception. A section on the research criterion for appointments and promotions states:

> An important factor in determining a faculty member's merit for appointment or promotion shall be his contributions in the form of research, publication, and other professional or artistic activities.

This policy then describes how research activities are evaluated in promotion practices:

> Publication in professional journals and books is the normal expression of research activity and will be the primary measure of achievement. Recognized standing as attested by fellow scholars outside the University should be a major consideration, especially for appointment and promotion to tenure positions. Appraisals in the form of book reviews or otherwise shall be considered important evidence. Textbooks and similar publications, normally considered evidence of teaching ability, shall count as creative work if they present new approaches and manifest scholarly research.

Such a detailed treatment of promotion criteria is unusual. Although such detail may be found in the bylaws of the university, they are not likely known by many faculty members. Probably most respondents who indicated specific, well-known promotion policies were referring to brief statements in their faculty handbooks.[4]

Practically all written policies include a systematic process of recommending faculty members for promotion. The following excerpts from written policies describe these recommendation procedures:

> Recommendations for promotion are made by the department heads to the Dean. Recommendations to ranks above assistant professor, if endorsed by the Dean, are forwarded to the President for approval via his Staff Committee on Leaves and Promotion.

> Official responsibility for recommending appointments and promotions in rank rests with the heads of departments, directors and deans of colleges. Authority to appoint, advance and promote resides in the President.

> Promotion in rank and increases in salary are recommended by the head of the department, the dean of the school or college concerned, and the Vice

---

[4] Some administrators who indicated that the specific criteria were spelled out and known by everyone sent along brief statements, such as faculty handbooks, as proof of this type of policy.

> President for Academic Affairs. The recommendation then goes to the President for approval and recommendation to the Board of Control and in certain instances the State Budget Commission.

These written policies are characteristic of one-half the policies reported by presidents and vice-presidents.

Unwritten promotion policies. The previous chapter pointed out that policies do not have to be written to serve as standards or norms. However, to become effective the policy should be accepted and understood. Approximately 20 per cent of the central administrators described their policies in this manner. Such unwritten policies express promotion as follows:

> Each person is considered as an individual with instruction, research, and service taken into account. Ordinarily a person is required to serve at least five years in rank as a minimum before promotion to the next rank.

The unwritten advancement policies also have common understandings of how recommendations progress through the university. The following comments made by two vice-presidents reflect this understanding:

> Here at the University promotions are generally based on a consensus from contemporaries, the department head, dean of the division, and the dean of administration. Of course, all promotions to full professorships must be submitted to, approved by, the president, who will take into consideration the value judgments of the parties indicated.

> Let me say simply that at this University the responsibility for recommending or denying promotions lies with administrative officers—Department Chairman, Dean, Vice President. The faculty constitution requires the Vice President to have an all-University advisory committee, and by custom each Dean also has such a committee.

The remaining policies (about one-third of the total) are also unwritten but described as varying from case to case. The following comments show these varying policies:

> One man may be promoted almost exclusively on his research-publication record. Another man in the same school may be promoted almost exclusively on his teaching effectiveness or his service record either to the school or to the public.

> Our promotional system depends on the dedication and good judgment of the administrative officers who operate it. They do not feel bound to use any mathematical formula nor weighting, and they do feel quite justified in considering each individual case subjectively on its own merits.

In total, these written and unwritten central promotion policies serve as the general framework in which actual promotion practices take place.

Central administration promotion policies

The previous section pointed out that practically all universities surveyed had some type of central promotion policy. This section describes how the central administrators carry out these policies in practice. Promotion practices, of course, vary a great deal within, as well as between, universities. Nevertheless, by taking a composite viewpoint of the top administrators of the population, one may gain some useful insights into central promotion practices. The following factors were used to investigate these practices: 1) the methods employed by central administrators to evaluate promotion criteria; 2) the relative weights actually given to the various promotion criteria in practice; and 3) the weighted locus of promotion decision-making in the university.

Methods of evaluation. The examination of central policies showed that all policies utilize some type of recommendation procedure. However, the policies generally say nothing about the methods of evaluation used to make these recommendations. The survey revealed that over one-third of the central administrators reported they did not use any consistent, objective method of faculty evaluation (see Table 4-3). About half the central administrators reported they use a current bibliography supplemented by the actual publications and research reports. Objective teaching reports are not widely used. The limited applicability of teaching reports was brought out by a vice-president who commented:

Table 4-3

Objective Faculty Evaluation Methods Utilized by Central Administrators[a]

Objective methods of evaluating faculty	*Number of respondents using this method*[b]	*Percentage of respondents using this method*
No consistent, objective evaluation procedure is used.	16	34
Current bibliography is maintained.	24	51
Publications and research reports are physically available.	23	49
Objective teaching reports are used.	16	34

[a] This excludes formal recommendation procedures.

[b] This number represents respondents who report one or more methods of evaluation. For example, a central administrator may report using a bibliography and teaching reports.

Teaching evaluation reports are available only at the request of the faculty member being evaluated.

Promotion criteria. Both written and unwritten promotion policies were shown to contain certain criteria which were to be used in assessing the promotability of faculty members. These policies, however, did not specify the relative importance that should be given to each criterion.[8] Nevertheless, in actual promotion practices certain criteria undoubtedly are given more weight than others.

To assess the influence of the criteria in practice, the central administrators were asked to indicate the relative weight of each criterion. To achieve uniformity, the administrators were asked to assign the percentage weights with regard to promoting an associate professor of business to full professor.

The survey indicated that research activity ranked first in the combined viewpoint of central administrators (see Table 4-4). Teaching effectiveness ranked second. Service and personal characteristics were assigned intermediate importance, while seniority and competitive bids were given very little weight in promotion decisions. These latter criteria, however, seem important in certain situations. A vice-president had this to say about seniority:

Table 4-4

Central Administrators' Perceptions of the Weights Attached to Various Promotion Criteria (Associate Professor of Business to Full Professor)

Promotion criteria	*(Avg.) Per cent weights attached by presidents*	*(Avg.) Per cent weights attached by vice-presidents*	*(Avg.) Per cent weights given by central administrators*
Personal Characteristics	15	11	12
Seniority	12	8	9
Service	15	11	12
Research activity	31	36	35
Teaching effectiveness	22	29	27
Competitive bids	5	5	5
Total	100	100	100

---

[8] One formal written policy lists the promotion criteria considered but then states, "The weight to be given each one of these factors will naturally be determined by what will best maintain the highest academic or professional standing of the department, college, school, or other subdivision of the university."

> Assuming the person has been in rank 4 to 5 years, seniority has little influence. At 2-3 years it has a large influence.

Although a vice-president assigned a zero weight to competitive bids, he stated:

> This one on many occasions will override all the others.

Yet, the general consensus concerning seniority and competitive bids is brought out by the following comments:

> Seniority should play very little part in the decision. Seniority could represent only one year's experience repeated 15, 20, or 25 times.
>
> Competitive bids should have practically no weight. This factor could lead to utter chaos both in promotions and in salary increases.

There was some difference between presidents and vice-presidents in their assignments of weights. Presidents gave slightly more weight to personal characteristics, seniority and service, and less to research and teaching than did the vice-presidents.[6]

Locus of decision-making. The investigation of policy characteristics found that both written and unwritten promotion policies have well-established recommendation procedures. In a formal sense, these policies generally have the president or the board of trustees make the final promotion decision. However, in actual practice each step in the recommendation procedure exerts varying degrees of influence in this final decision. To

Table 4-5

Central Administrators' Weighting of Influence in Various Positions in Promotion Decisions (Associate Professor of Business to Full Professor)

Position of influence	*Average per cent weights given by central administrators*
Discipline colleagues	21
Other faculty members	6
Department heads	23
Faculty committee	12
Associate dean	1
Dean of college	21
Vice-president	9
President	7
Board of trustees	0
Total	100

---

[6] Some of the difference may be explained by the relatively small number of presidents responding.

determine the actual locus of promotion decision-making, the central administrators were asked to express the weighted influence each position in the recommendation hierarchy has in the final decision.

The survey results show that discipline colleagues, the department head, and the college dean have the greatest weight in promotion decisions (see Table 4-5). Faculty committees were also given much influence in some universities.[7] Other faculty members (this excludes discipline colleagues), the vice-president, and the president were given very little influence. Comments such as the following may account for the low weights central administrators assigned to themselves:

> The President is involved in promotion cases but usually accepts decisions from below.

The associate dean position is not utilized in many institutions, but even where his position existed, he was given very little influence. Finally, the boards of trustees were viewed by central administrators as having virtually no weight in promotion decisions. A president declared:

> The Board of Trustees has almost none if any influence.

When these individual hierarchical positions are combined into organizational levels of central administration, decentral administration, and faculty, the following results emerge. Decentral administration is viewed as the organizational level having the greatest influence in promotion decisions (see Table 4-6). This viewpoint is expressed by a vice-president who declared:

Table 4-6

Central Administrators' Weighting of the Influence of Organizational Levels in the Promotion Process (Associate Professor of Business to Full Professor)[a]

Organizational level	*Average percentage weights assigned by central administrators*
Faculty	39
Decentral administrators	45
Central administrators	16
Total	100

[a] This table represents the positions of Table 4-5 categorized according to organizational levels.

---

[7] For example, three administrators from separate universities applied a 50 per cent weight to faculty committees.

> Our practice regarding promotions at the university is to leave most of the responsibility for recommendations for promotion to the department head and dean.

The faculties are ranked second, while the central administrators view themselves as playing a relatively insignificant role in promotion decisions. This minor role is implied by a central adminstrator who concluded:

> The administrative officer cannot hide behind his [faculty] committee. He has the responsibility, but in practice administrators seldom take action contrary to the committee's recommendations.

These results imply that decentralized administrations have the most influence in promotion decisions. The role of this organizational level in promotion policies and practices is investigated in the next section.

DECENTRALIZED PROMOTION POLICIES AND PRACTICES

The investigation of central promotion policies and practices revealed that there may be separate promotion policies and practices at the decentralized level of the university. Evidence for the existence of decentral policies was found in formal central policies. The following passage taken from an all-university promotion policy points to these separate policies:

> Each college and school of the University shall work out and state in writing a definite procedure for faculty participation in, or review of, appointments and promotions . . . if it is found to be satisfactory, recommend its acceptance and implementation by the University Senate as part of the plan or organization governing the respective school, or college.

Moreover, central administrators' supplementary remarks support the existence of separate decentral policies and practices:

Table 4-7

The Responses of Business College Administrators to a Survey of Faculty Promotion Policies and Practices

Decentral business college administrators	*Total number in sample*	*Number of usable responses*	*Percentage of usable responses*
Deans	46	35	76
Associate deans[a]	10	8	80
Department heads	34	29	85
Total	90	72	80

[a] Associate deans were surveyed only in colleges which were not departmentalized. The investigator realizes that this position may have little to do with academic personnel administration but was included in the study so that at least two decentral administrators would represent the college of business.

> I am forwarding your letter of November 16, plus the enclosed questionnaire to the Dean of Arts and Sciences. I feel that he is in a much better position to answer the questions you raise.

> . . . in the light of our practices with which I am familiar, [your questions] would require considerable qualification, by reason of the differences among the colleges, and a relatively high degree of autonomy of the different colleges.

These decentralized promotion policies and practices are reviewed in this section.

A total of 90 business college administrators were surveyed to obtain information about their policies and practices. Over 90 per cent responded, with 80 per cent being usable for tabulation purposes (see Table 4-7).[8] The respondents represented all except three schools of business in the population.

Decentral promotion policies

Two-thirds of the decentral administrators indicated that their colleges had advancement policies which did not strictly conform to the policies of the central university.[9] Similar to central policies, these decentral policies serve as the norm or standard for decentral administrators' and faculty members' performances. The survey indicated that decentral policies sometimes are formally written out in detailed form[10] but more commonly are in unwritten form sustained by habit and tradition. A dean made the following comment about his promotion policy:

> Aside from some elementary and basic instructions, there are no institutional rules which govern faculty promotion. Recommendations are formulated by

---

[8] Some of the non-usable responses were the result of the dean (or department head) noting that the department head (or dean) had already filled out a similar questionnaire. For example, a dean stated, "The Department Head has already completed and returned to you the brief questionnaire relative to your research concerning the administration of faculty personnel policies and practices in major universities. Therefore, I see no reason to duplicate this and I am returning this questionnaire to you. The best of luck on this study." These responses were not double counted. In other cases they were unable to give usable responses because of reorganization. They stated, "In view of the fact that our faculty personnel policies are currently in a state of transition I cannot make a meaningful report for your study. I would, however, be interested in your summary when it is completed and should appreciate the receipt of a copy."

[9] These separate decentral policies also represent about two-thirds of the business schools surveyed.

[10] For example, the most detailed promotion policy in the entire study came from a college of business administration. This eleven-page document contained major sections on statement of general policy, procedures for faculty evaluation and advancement, criteria for promotions and pay raises, teaching effectiveness, research and writing, university service, professional competence, personal equation, graduate faculty, submission of data by faculty member, faculty evaluation form, interview conferences, and a suggested check list of factors related to effective teaching.

> Department Heads and either concurred on, discussed or negated by the Dean of the School, who in turn makes his recommendations to the President's Office.

Another example of decentral policy was this comment by a department head:

> In our college a recommendation for promotion must come from the department chairman. No one else may make such a recommendation. An administrative council in the college which consists of all department chairmen, then take a secret ballot on each recommendation which is forwarded to the dean.

The majority of decentral administrators reported themselves as being primarily responsible for making promotion policies for the faculty members of their colleges. The policies formulated at the decentral level thus serve as standards and norms for the promotion practices of the business colleges.

Decentral promotion practices

The ways in which the decentral administrators carry out their policies in actual practice are described in this section. The investigation is difficult to objectify because of the great amount of variation and the inherent informal aspects of promotion practices. Nevertheless, by utilizing the same areas investigated in central promotion practices, one may also gain insights into decentral practices.

Methods of evaluation. Both central and decentral promotion policies generally agree on the procedures for recommendations. Seldom, however, do these policies contain explicit provisions for the systematic use of objective evaluation methods in making the recommendation. To determine the practices of evaluation, the deans and department heads were asked how they made evaluations. One-third reported no consistent, objective evaluation procedure was presently used (see Table 4-8). Half the total decentralized administrators who responded utilized bibliographies, and slightly less included the publications for reading in the evaluation of business school faculty members. Objective teaching reports were not widely used.

A more detailed breakdown revealed that deans tend to use more objective methods of evaluation than do department heads. This probably results from the closer contact and understanding department heads have of their faculty members. A department head stated:

> I keep informed of professional activities, reputation as a teacher, university activities and publications.

Promotion criteria. Another determinant of promotion practices is the

Table 4-8

Objective Faculty Evaluation Methods Utilized by Decentral Administrators[a]

Objective methods of evaluating faculty	*Business college deans*		*Business department heads and associate deans*		*Total decentral administrators*	
	Number reporting	*Per cent of respondents*	*Number reporting*	*Per cent of respondents*	*Number reporting*	*Per cent of respondents*
No consistent, objective evaluation procedure is used.	9	26	15	40	24	33
Current bibliography is maintained.	20	57	16	43	36	50
Publications and research reports are physically available.	19	54	14	38	33	46
Objective teaching reports are used.	10	29	10	27	20	28

[a] This excludes formal recommendation procedures.

Table 4-9

Decentralized Administrations' Perceptions of the Weights Attached to Various Promotion Criteria (Associate Professor of Business to Full Professor)

Promotion criteria	*Avg. per cent weights attached by business college deans*	*Avg. per cent weights attached by business department heads and associate deans*	*Avg. per cent weights given by decentral administrators*
Personal characteristics	13	12	13
Seniority	10	8	9
Service	12	13	13
Research	33	34	33
Teaching	27	28	27
Competitive bids	5	5	5
Total	100	100	100

Table 4-10

Decentral Administrators' Weighting of the Influence of Various Positions in Promotion Decisions (Associate Professor of Business to Full Professor)

Position of influence	*Average per cent weights assigned by deans*	*Average per cent weights assigned by department heads and associate deans*	*Average per cent weights assigned by decentral administrators*
Discipline colleagues	13	8	10
Other faculty members	4	7	6
Department heads	21	29	25
Faculty committee	16	14	15
Associate dean	2	2	2
Dean of college	28	24	26
Vice-president	7	9	8
President	9	7	8
Board of trustees	0	0	0
Total	100	100	100

Table 4-11

Decentral Administrations' Weighting of the Influence of Organizational Levels in the Promotion Process (Associate Professor of Business to Full Professor)[a]

Organizational level	*Average percentage weights assigned by decentral administrators*
Faculty	31
Decentral administrators	53
Central administrators	16
Total	100

[a] This table represents the positions of Table 4-10 categorized according to organizational levels.

---

relative weights applied by decentral administrators to various promotion criteria. The weights are rarely specified by either central or decentral policy. The weights are likely to vary from case to case. Nevertheless, some understanding of decentral promotion practices is achieved by averaging percentage weights assigned by deans and department heads (see Table 4-9).

The decentral administrators' assignment of percentage weights were similar to those given by central administrators. Research activity was given the greatest relative weight in promotions to full professor. Teaching effectiveness was ranked second; service and personal characteristics were tied for third; seniority was given fourth; and competitive bids were ranked least important. In this weighting there were no significant differences between the deans and department heads.

Locus of decision-making. The determination of decentral administrators' views of the power structure in faculty promotions also infers what practices actually take place in the promotion process. The weighted locus of promotion decision-making is presented in Table 4-10. The decentral administrators rated themselves as having the most influence in the promotion process. Given secondary importance were discipline colleagues and faculty committees. Other faculty members, the vice-president, and president were given very little weight, and the board of trustees were viewed to have no power in the promotion process.

A closer examination of Table 4-10 discloses some differences between deans and department heads. Deans give more emphasis to the role played by discipline colleagues and themselves than do the department heads. Department heads, on the other hand, perceive themselves as having much more power than the deans see them as having.

Table 4-11 represents the categorizing of individual positions of the hierarchy into organizational levels. The decentral administrators view themselves as having the most influence in the promotion process. The faculties rank a distant second, while the central administrative levels of the universities are perceived to have very little weight.

SUMMARY OF PROMOTION POLICIES AND PRACTICES

Faculty members' advancement in rank in major state universities seems to be established in university-wide policies. A closer examination showed that these policies varied a great deal among universities. Half the central administrators of the universities reported a policy which was spelled out and known by everyone, for example, a statement in the faculty handbook. The other half of the all-university policies were reported as unwritten and variable but implicitly understood by a majority of the faculty.

Some central administration promotion practices were also determined. These practices were presented according to three areas of investigation. *First,* the survey showed that approximately half the administrators reportedly utilize a bibliography supplemented by the actual publications. About a third reported the use of some type of teaching reports.

Second, on the average, central administrators ranked advancement criteria as follows: 1) research, 2) teaching, 3) service and personnel characteristics (tie), 5) seniority, and 6) competitive bids.

Third, the weighted locus of promotion decision-making revealed that central administrators perceive the decentral administrative level as having the most power or influence in the hierarchical structure.

The policies and practices for advancement in rank of this decentralized level were then examined in detail.

The decentralized administrators generally considered their own colleges to have independent or semi-independent policies on promotion. These decentral policies primarily evolve from the decentral administrators themselves and are usually unwritten.

The investigation of decentral promotion practices revealed essentially the same practices that were reported by central administrators:

First, about half the deans reportedly use bibliographies supplemented by the actual publications. The department heads, however, do not use this method of evaluation as extensively. Neither deans nor department heads make wide use of objective teaching reports.

Second, on the average, decentral administrators ranked advancement criteria as follows: 1) research, 2) teaching, 3) service and personal characteristics (tie), 5) seniority, and 6) competitive bids.

Third, the weighted locus of promotion decision-making revealed that decentral administrators perceive themselves as having the most power or influence in the hierarchical structure.

Chapter V

The Analysis of Central Control of Decentralized Business Faculty Promotions

The promotion policies and practices of the population according to the descriptions given by central and decentral administrators have already been described. This chapter analyzes those policies and practices from the viewpoint of the management concept of central control. This viewpoint serves as the frame of reference throughout the analysis.

THE ROLE OF PROMOTION POLICIES IN CENTRAL CONTROL

Inherent in the concept of control is the existence of a plan which serves as the standard or norm for administrative decision-making and personnel performance. Applied to academic institutions, effective control would imply the presence of an all-university promotion policy. The preceding chapter indicated that practically all central administrators reported such a policy.

Effective control, however, does not cease with the mere existence of policy. The policy must also be known and accepted. The central administrators stated that these requirements are met by the policies of their universities. However, to get a better picture of policy understanding and acceptance, the faculty members are directly examined and analyzed.

About 95 per cent of the faculty members surveyed returned usable responses. The characteristics of these faculty respondents are as follows:

1. The career patterns of faculty members in their present institution are shown in Table 5-1. The table shows that 38 per cent of the sample have been promoted to full professor, while 33 per cent have made associate but not full, and 23 per cent have not been promoted since being appointed to the staff.
2. About half the faculty members reported that they make no contribution to promotion decisions. About a third give informal opinions, while the remainder serve on promotion committees or give formal recommendations (see Table 5-2).

3. Most of the faculty members have published articles or books. However, 6 per cent of the full professors and 18 per cent of the associate professors reported no publications prior to their current ranks. Moreover, nearly one-fourth of the full professors and associate professors reported only one to three articles and no books (see Table 5-3).

These faculty members were surveyed to determine their understanding and acceptance of central promotion policies.

Faculty members' understanding and acceptance of policies

To obtain information for the analysis, the investigator asked the faculty members two direct questions. First, were the promotion policies of their institution communicated to them? Second, what was the general consen-

---

Table 5-1

Faculty Respondents' Career Patterns in Their Present Institution

Promotions since original appointment	*Number of respondents*	*Percentage of total respondents*
No Promotion	30	23
Promotion to assistant professor	9	7
Promotion to associate professor	33	25
Promotion to full professor	19	15
Promotion to assistant and associate	10	8
Promotion to associate and full	19	15
Promotion to assistant, associate, and full	11	8
Total	131	101[a]

[a] Due to rounding.

Table 5-2

Faculty Members' Participation in the Promotion Process

Types of contribution	*Number of respondents*[a]	*Percentage of respondents making this contribution*
No contribution	61	47
Give formal recommendations	29	22
Give informal opinions	40	31
Serve on promotion committees	27	21

[a] This number represents respondents who report one or more types of contribution. For example, a faculty member may give formal recommendations and also serve on promotion committees.

sus of themselves and their colleagues concerning promotion policies and practices?

The answers to the first question are shown in Table 5-4. The six faculty members reporting no policies represent six separate universities. This absence of any recognized policy is brought out by the following professor's comment:

> There are no formal promotion policies or evaluation procedures that I know about. I have been told that someone makes the decision to promote based on rather vague situational factors which may very likely be different in different situations.

Table 5-3

Faculty Members' Publishing Record Prior to Their Current Rank

	Before promotion to full professor		*Before promotion to associate professor*	
Number of publications	*Number*	*Per cent*	*Number*	*Per cent*
0 articles and 0 books	3	6	9	18
1-3 articles and 0 books	12	24	13	28
4 or more articles and 0 books	14	29	10	21
1-3 articles and 1 or more books	2	4	9	19
4 or more articles and 1 or more books	18	37	6	13
Total	49	100	47	99[a]

[a] Due to rounding.

Table 5-4

Business Faculty Members' Descriptions of the Promotion Policies of Their Universities

Policy description	*Number of faculty members responding*	*Percentage of respondents*
There are no policies.	6	5
The policy is nebulous and confused and could not be communicated to anyone.	34	26
The policy is not necessarily written but is implicitly understood by the majority of the faculty.	53	41
The policy is spelled out and known by everyone.	36	28
Total	129	100

The professor making the above comment was not alone. Two of his colleagues in the same university reported that they had heard of a policy, but it was so nebulous and confused that they could not tell it to anyone. This nebulous, confused description given by over one-fourth of the faculty respondents is expressed by the following faculty member's statement:

> The guidelines for promotion are vague. They are used most often to point out why people are not promoted rather than as a basis for a promotion. . . . Teaching faculty get promotions on the basis of securing offers from other schools.

Once again, this statement does not seem to be that of an irate professor, because his colleagues expressed the same opinion. Yet, despite these faculty observations, the central administrators in these universities (the president in the first case and the academic vice-president in the second case) declared that their promotion policies were implicitly understood by the majority of the faculty members.

Carrying the analysis one step further is Table 5-5, which gives faculty descriptions of promotion policies in universities reportedly having policies spelled out and known by everyone. The table shows that less than one-third of the faculty respondents agreed with this description of advancement policies given by their central administrators. One out of every four professors in these universities not only felt the policy was not spelled out and known, but also felt the policy was nebulous and confused. Table 5-6 emphasizes disagreement as a result of differing descriptions of promotion policies between top administrators and faculty members.

In total, the re-examination of central promotion policies seemed to reveal that in many cases the faculty do not understand promotion policies. This lack of understanding may be the result of one or both of the following factors. First, there may be poor communication between top administration and faculty concerning advancement in rank. Second, there may not be any well-established central promotion policies. Either possibility has implications for effective central control. Two of the basic foundations of control are first, an effective plan or, in this case, an established promotion policy and second, an effective communication process. If a recognized policy is nonexistent or is not communicated forward and the results fed back, effective control does not exist.

In addition to the lack of understanding policies, there is also some indication that many faculty members do not approve of the current promotion policies of their universities. Table 5-7 shows that over one-third of the professors were not satisfied. Moreover, in nine universities at least two out of the three faculty members surveyed stated that the promotion policies and practices were unsatisfactory. This represents 20 per

Table 5-5

Faculty Members' Descriptions of Promotion Policies in Universities Where Central Administrators Described the Policies as Spelled Out and Known by Everyone

Policy description by faculty members	*Number of faculty members*	*Per cent*
There are no policies.	1	2
The policy is nebulous and confused and could not be communicated to anyone.	12	23
The policy is not necessarily written but is implicitly understood by the majority of the faculty.	23	43
The policy is spelled out and known by everyone.	17	32
Total	53	100

Table 5-6

Central Administrations' Descriptions of Promotion Policies in Universities Having Faculty Members Who State Non-Existent or Nebulous Promotion Policies

Policy description by central administrators	*Number of central administrators*	*Per cent*
There is no promotion policy, as such, at the central level.	3	8
The policy is not written and probably varies from case to case.	10	26
The specific criteria are not necessarily written but implicitly understood by the majority of the faculty.	12	31
The specific criteria are spelled out and known by everyone.	14	36
Total	39	101[a]

[a] Due to rounding.

cent of the universities in the population. On the other hand, only 8 per cent of the faculty members stated that promotion policies were well accepted and contributed to high faculty morale. Two out of the three faculty members in only one university reported such well-accepted policies.

No significant patterns emerged when the ranks and publication records of those professors reporting either extreme of acceptance were examined.

Table 5-7

Business Faculty Members' Descriptions of the Consensus of Themselves and Their Colleagues Concerning Promotion Policies and Practices to Full Professor

Descriptions of general consensus on promotions	*Number of respondents*	*Percentage of respondents*
Very poor. Morale is declining because of the apparent lack of administrative rationale or consistency in promotions.	10	8
Not very good. Some bad promotions have been made, and there is room for improvement.	34	26
Recognizing the inherent problems involved in promotion decisions, our administration does a pretty good job.	77	58
Promotion policies and practices in our institution are well accepted by all and contribute to high morale of the faculty.	10	8
Total	131	100

Their publication records ranged from no publications to many articles and books. Less than one-fifth of those reporting an unsatisfactory promotion process were themselves promoted to full professor. On the other hand, three of the ten respondents reporting extremely good advancement policies and practices were already promoted to full professor.

As expected, there was a high correlation between policy understanding and approval of the promotion process. Two-thirds of the faculty members who indicated their policy was nonexistent or vague also reported morale was declining or at least that there was room for improvement. Furthermore, by analyzing the data from the ten professors who indicated a well-accepted policy, one finds that four of them report an entirely understood policy while the remaining six described an implicit policy understood by the majority.

If faculty members do not approve of present promotion policies or do not feel they are rewarded according to them, there could be a decrease in morale and/or the creation of new norms for performance. The effect on morale and retention of high quality faculty was expressed by a nationally known expert in his field:

> My reasons for leaving . . . included the promotional miasma there.

The implicit creation of new norms for faculty performance also has implications for control. A well-established policy is required to serve as the standards for administrative control of faculty performance. If administrators are using one set of standards for control and the faculty are using another set of implicit standards for performance, then there may be conflicts which impede the attainment of the goals of the university.

The effect of decentral promotion policies on central control

Chapter I pointed out that the modern academic administration of the modern university is highly decentralized. This high degree of decentralization was thought not to be the result of purposeful administrative design. Instead, decentralization was said to exist by default from the increased size; the specialized, professional character of the personnel; and perhaps, as the previous section pointed out, the lack of understanding or acceptance of present central promotion policies. The outgrowth of this situation is reflected by the large number of decentral promotion policies reported by the business college deans and department heads. The faculty respondents verified that at the decentral level there are independent promotion policies. Some faculty comments suggesting independent decentral policies are the following:

> Although as I read the questions, they seem to apply to the university, my knowledge is confined to the College of Business, and I think the criteria are different in other colleges.
>
> Considerable variation among departments and in various schools. There is not too much consistency in the whole university.
>
> We have a new Dean and his policies on promotion are just getting into effect. It is difficult to answer many of your questions that relate to the entire University.

The question considered in the analysis was what effect these decentral policies have on central control.

The concept of decentralization is important and is respected in current management philosophy. Decentralization is usually advocated to solve large size and complexity problems of modern organizations. In decentralized organizations, much of the planning function is delegated to the operating divisions. In academic institutions, top administration must also delegate promotion plans or policies to the colleges and/or departments of the university. However, effective management does not cease with the act of delegation. There must be central control of the decentral plans or policies. In terms of academic promotion policies, this control implies that central administration should make sure that decentralized policies are coordinated and are consistent with the policies of the total institution.

The analysis of promotion policies of schools of business revealed that this central administrative control function may be lacking. Only slightly more than half the decentral administrators stated that central policies were used as guidelines for their decentral promotion policies. The other half of the decentral administrators apparently did not use central policies as norms in formulating their own promotion policies. Furthermore, as shown in the previous chapter, a majority of the decentral administrators felt themselves—not the central administration—to be primarily responsible for the formulation of promotion policies which affected their faculties.

There may be two reasons for these results. First, there may not be any recognized central policies which serve as norms for decentral policies. Second, the lack of purposeful administrative design for decentralization may explain the absence of central control of the decentral policies.

In summary, the analysis of the role of promotion policies in central control has shown the following:

1. Many faculty members do not seem to understand or approve of the promotion policies of their universities. Reasons for this result were suggested to be poor communication and the nonexistence of effective, recognized policies at the central level of the universities. Either reason implies poor central controls.
2. The second subsection analyzed decentral promotion policies. Here it was found that decentral policies often seem to be formulated without guides from central policy or central administration. The reasons probably evolve from the lack of purposeful administrative design and, once again, from the nonexistence of recognized central policies.

As a whole, this analysis revealed that effective central control seems to suffer primarily from the lack of well understood and accepted all-university promotion policies.

THE ROLE OF CENTRAL CONTROL IN PROMOTION PRACTICES

The preceding analysis of the part central policy plays in central administrative control was indirect in the sense of analyzing the basis for control rather than the direct application of control. This section analyzes control over actual practices in the promotion process.

The promotion practices of the population were described according to three areas: 1) the objective methods of evaluation, 2) the relative weights given to various promotion criteria, and 3) the weighted locus of promotion decision-making. These areas were common to the investigation of both central and decentral promotion practices. This section re-examines these reported practices in light of specific questionnaire responses and additional comments made by the business faculty respondents, and the model of effective control.

Central administration promotion practices

Almost all central administrators felt they could make an objective evaluation of faculty research (see Table 5-8). Moreover, a majority felt the same about evaluating teaching ability. However, only a small percentage of professors agreed that this could be done (see Table 5-9). Most of them felt that under current evaluation practices, central administrators could not effectively evaluate their teaching or research. Faculty members' comments concerning the lack of effective teaching evaluation were common. The following statements are representative:

Table 5-8

Central Administrators' Views on Being Able to Objectively Evaluate Faculty Members' Research Activity and Teaching Ability

	Can make objective evaluation			
Central administrators' responses to question of objective faculty evaluation	*of research activity?*		*of teaching ability?*	
	Number	*Per cent*	*Number*	*Per cent*
Almost in all cases	10	22	1	2
Most of the time	29	63	27	59
Seldom	7	15	16	35
Almost never	0	0	2	4
Total	46	100	46	100

Table 5-9

Business Faculty Members' Views on Being Evaluated by Central Administrators According to Present University Faculty Evaluation Procedures and Practices

	Evaluations made by vice president		*Evaluations made by president*	
Type of activity evaluated	*Percentage faculty members saying YES*	*Percentage faculty members saying NO*	*Percentage faculty members saying YES*	*Percentage faculty members saying NO*
Research	20	80	17	83
Teaching	9	91	7	93

> Current measures of teaching effectiveness extremely unreliable, and likely invalid.
>
> In teaching effectiveness little or no information is sought. The only time it is assumed to be less than excellent is when students complain.

A central administrator, expressing a seemingly minority viewpoint, brought out the problems of the administrator in evaluating academic personnel:

> It is very difficult to measure quality in either research or teaching and do it with any preciseness. You may secure value judgments from many sources, . . . it may be acceptable, very good, excellent, and outstanding to the point of attracting national or international attention. Teaching ability is likewise very difficult to measure precisely.

Nevertheless, administrative evaluations are made every time someone is promoted or is not promoted. How are these evaluations made? The following case seems to be the typical situation:

> The vice-president reported he could practically always make an objective evaluation of research activity and most of the time teaching ability. He was then asked *how* he makes these objective evaluations. His reply was, "This is a poor question because there is an adequate combination of things." However, a faculty member taken from this central administrator's university did not feel the question was poor. He unequivocally stated, "We have no evaluation procedures and practices to the best of my knowledge other than the Department Head and Dean."

The previous chapter disclosed that about two-thirds of the central administrators reported the use of consistent, objective methods of evaluation. Excluded from the objective methods were the recommendation procedures used by all universities. Tangible, objective methods of evaluation were examined. These methods consisted of a bibliography accompanied by the publications and, in some cases, objective teaching reports. Once again, however, the faculties do not necessarily agree with these reported promotion practices. For instance, a vice-president stated he used a bibliography and teaching reports to evaluate faculty members. Yet, a faculty member from his university stated:

> In my opinion we make little provision for any measurement and no observation; hearsay evidence is all that is available to evaluators at the present time.

Moreover, in a similar situation, the president reported using a bibliography, a review of the publications, and objective teaching reports. A faculty member commented:

> There are no formal evaluation procedures that I know about. As far as I know, no one has seen an evaluation form for professors.

In total, central administrators generally thought they could do an adequate job of evaluating professors under current practices. The professors themselves do not agree. The comments of faculty members indicated that top administrators cannot rely solely on subjective evaluations of performance. One professor stated:

> The higher the echelon of administration, the less the university official can see in terms of subjective judgment.

The need for two interrelated administrative activities was implied in order to make evaluations at the central level. First, there was an indication that some type of objective evaluation procedures are needed. For instance, a vice-president remarked:

> The real problem in determining promotions and salary increases is to set up a consistent, objective evaluation procedure.

Second, and probably more important, the respondents recognized that central administrators must also depend on decentralized promotion practices. This dependence was brought out as follows:

> The more distant the person or persons in the hierarchy from the instructor or researcher, the less he knows about him and the more he has to depend on the recommendations of those closer to the person.

Decentral promotion practices

The previous chapter pointed out that about two-thirds of the deans and department heads utilize objective methods of evaluation. This use of objective methods was about the same as that of the central administrators. The business college deans and department heads are close to the professor and his accomplishments. Hence, they did not see the need for objective methods of evaluation. The dean typically has a faculty of about fifty, and the department head may have only five or ten faculty members under him. Such a situation gives intimate day-to-day contact with resulting administrative knowledge and understanding of the activities of faculty members. A department head emphasized this by reporting:

> We have a small department (11 full time), making close contact and intimate knowledge possible.

This close relationship between most business college administrators and faculty members probably explains the confidence which decentral administrators had in their ability to evaluate their faculties (see Table 5-10). All the deans and all but two department heads felt that in most cases they could evaluate research. Although they were not as sure of their ability to judge teaching, three out of every four department heads felt they could judge it most of the time. The majority of the faculty members agreed that their deans and department heads can make these evaluations (see Table 5-11). However, the professors thought that research was much easier for decentral administrators to evaluate than was teaching. A professor declared:

> Even the department head might have difficulty in supporting his judgment of teaching effectiveness.

This above feeling probably led the faculty members to rate research as the major criterion for promotion (see Table 5-12). The weight given to research coincides with the weighting given by both central and decentral administrators. The second place given to teaching also agreed

---

Table 5-10

Decentral Administrators' Views on Being Able to Objectively Evaluate Faculty Members' Research Activity and Teaching Ability

Decentral administrators' responses to question of objective faculty evaluation	*Can make objective evaluation of research activity?* Number	Per cent	*of teaching ability?* Number	Per cent
Almost in all cases	29	41	11	15
Most of the time	40	56	42	58
Seldom	2	3	19	27
Almost never	0	0	0	0
Total	71	100	72	100

Table 5-11

Business Faculty Members' Views on Being Evaluated by Decentral Administrators According to Present University Faculty Evaluation Procedures and Practices

	Evaluations made by department head		*Evaluations made by dean*	
Type of activity evaluated	*Percentage faculty members saying YES*	*Percentage faculty members saying NO*	*Percentage faculty members saying YES*	*Percentage faculty members saying NO*
Research	84	16	60	40
Teaching	74	26	40	60

with that given by the administrators, but the faculty respondents gave less absolute weight to teaching. The attitude of faculty members toward the effect of teaching ability on promotion decisions was brought out by comments such as the following:

> I would rank teaching effectiveness much higher as a weight in promotion decisions, except for the almost impossible task of measuring the teaching effectiveness. Unfortunately, it appears to be a subjective decision, which is difficult to measure.

The weighting by the faculty members of the other promotion criteria was approximately the same as that of both central and decentral administrators. One professor's opinion of promotion criteria was expressed as follows:

> Good personal characteristics, seniority, and teaching are helpful in being promoted and are always taken into account. However, research activity is the only really necessary criterion—perhaps because no impossible teachers survive to the associate level.

Competitive bids are viewed as being somewhat unique as a basis for promotion. On an informal basis, competitive bids may have much influence in promotion decisions. This indirect importance of competitive bids was implied in some professors' comments:

> I would judge the importance of competitive bids is highly variable. However, there must be some weight given to this criterion, especially if the bid comes from a "prestige" school—none if it comes from a "lesser" school.

> Competitive bids obviously not stated as a criterion but still one of the most effective levers for a good man.

Table 5-12

Business Faculty Members' Perceptions of the Weights Presently Attached to Various Promotion Criteria (Associate Professor of Business to Full Professor)

Promotion criteria	*Average percentage weights assigned by business faculty members*
Personal characteristics	14
Seniority	14
Service	10
Research activity	38
Teaching effectiveness	16
Competitive bids	8
Total	100

The final factor used to investigate promotion practices was the weighting of the locus of promotion decision-making. This investigation found that both central and decentral administrators viewed the decentralized level of the university as having the most power in the promotion process. The faculty members concur with this viewpoint (see Table 5-13). They perceive their deans and department heads as having the greatest influence in promotion decisions. Faculty members' remarks such as the following imply decentral administrators' power in promotions:

> If a department chairman does not recommend a man for a promotion, the dean does not consider the person. If the dean does not concur, the Academic Vice-President does not consider, nor does he have the opportunity to consider, the man.

Such power in the hands of decentralized administration was viewed in positive or negative terms, depending on the personality and leadership of the administrator in question. A professor declared:

> The situation here is extremely bad—primarily because of the chief administrator of the Business College more than any other reason. Unfortunately, this man is not at all rational in his decisions about his faculty relationships.

This statement does not seem to represent a small minority because all faculty members surveyed in his university made similar responses. This does not imply that the decentral administrator cannot play a positive role in the promotion process. The professor quoted directly above added:

Table 5-13

Business Faculty Members' Weighting of Various Positions' Influence in the Promotion Process

Position of influence	*Average percentage weights given by business faculty*[a]
Discipline colleagues	12
Other faculty members	7
Department heads	26
Faculty committee	14
Associate dean	2
Dean of college	29
Vice president	3
President	7
Board of trustees	0
Total	100

[a] The nonexistence of department heads, associate deans, and faculty committees in some universities causes a slight negative bias in averaging the percentage weights for these positions.

> This situation is quite tragic since the previous Dean was of quite another type.

This positive role which decentral administration should perform was also implied by a professor in another university:

> Two qualified faculty members were forced to leave since not promoted after attaining necessary credentials for promotion. If both the department head and dean ignore creative and productive effort of the faculty to maintain the faculty committee's power structure, only those who bend and pay the price can enter "the club."

The faculty respondents also concur with both central and decentral administration in viewing the faculty as playing the second most important part in the promotional process. The following professors' comments bring out the importance of faculty participation in the promotion process.

> A man not likely to be considered if not recommended by discipline colleagues. Faculty code provides for overriding of Department Head, but not Dean, i.e., Dean must consider man whose colleagues vote for and Department Head votes against.

> A member of the man's department is given the responsibility of preparing a case. He collects publications and solicits formal appraisals both from within and outside the university. The department promotion committee then recommends or refuses to recommend. A campus-wide ad hoc committee then considers the case. Then the campus budget committee. Then [the top administration]. The most serious considerations are the first three—department, ad hoc, and campus budget committees.

> About this time of the year (November) each individual full professor is asked to make recommendations for increases in pay and rank for teachers below full professor. This includes all teachers not just those in our [department].

Supplementary comments suggest that decentralizing to the faculty level of the university may cause problems. The following faculty statements point to some possible difficulties which may evolve from the use of faculty committees:

> Our department head and dean recommend the promotion to a faculty committee—who either approve or disapprove. The faculty committee has no one on it from the business school. This makes it damn tough to get the promotion.

> [Promotion] policies are of little value when applied at the discretion of so-called faculty budget councils. Applications are highly subjective—so much that desire to control all aspects of college activities is very obvious to all.

The central administrative level of the university was given very little weight by all three organizational levels in the university. This is because central administration delegates much of the promotion process to decentral administration and faculty. However, their responsibility does not end with the act of delegation. The positive role central administration should perform in academic administration was implied in faculty comments such as the following:

> Things were pretty bad here until we had a change in the top administrative post of the university. Since then, there has been a world of difference.

In summary, the analysis of promotion practices revealed that central administrators generally felt they could objectively evaluate faculty personnel. The faculties did not agree. The objective methods of evaluation reportedly used by central administrators were generally unknown to the faculty members.

The top administrators were found to be dependent upon the deans, department heads, and faculty for most promotion practices. The small size of most business colleges and departments was given as an explanation for the great confidence decentral administrators had in their ability to evaluate their personnel. The faculty members agreed that their deans and department heads could make these objective evaluations. However, they viewed research to be easier to evaluate than teaching.

In assessing the importance of various promotion criteria, the faculty agreed with both levels of administration. They placed research activity as the number one criterion presently considered in promotion decisions. Teaching ability ranked second but was weighted somewhat lower by the professors.

Finally, all three organizational levels of the university agreed that the decentral administrative level of the university had the greatest influence in promotion decisions. Such a powerful influence was viewed by the faculty in positive and negative terms. Their viewpoints primarily depended upon the personality and leadership of the administrators involved.

The general consensus of the presidents, vice-presidents, deans, department heads, and faculties was that central administration had very little, if any, weight in the promotion process. This minor influence could be the result of several factors. The primary reason given was the organizational necessity for decentralization. However, the central administrators should maintain central control over the decentralized promotion practices. This central control function is examined in detail in the next section.

THE DIRECT EXERCISE OF CENTRAL CONTROL

This section directly describes and analyzes the central control function in the decentralized promotion process of the specified universities. The first section determines how often and why central administrators reject recommendations from below. The second section investigates and analyzes

Table 5-14

Frequency of Central Administrators' Rejection of a Positive Recommendation from Below

Frequency of rejection	*Number of respondents*	*Percentage of respondents*
Never	1	2
Very seldom	20	43
Sometimes	25	53
Quite often	1	2
Total	47	100

the control exercised by top administrators over the research standards for advancement.

Central administrators' rejection of decentralized recommendations

Central administrators were asked to indicate on a four-point scale how often they reject a positive recommendation from decentral administration. The results of this inquiry indicated that almost half the central administrators reported they seldom, if ever, reject a positive recommendation (see Table 5-14). Some of the comments supplementing such responses were the following:

> I have only rejected one recommendation and that was a most complicated situation.
>
> So few recommendations have been rejected that no pattern has emerged.

These results have implications for central control. However, the fact that central administrators seldom reject positive recommendations from below does not necessarily mean that no control exists. There may be perfect accord between standards and performance. Furthermore, there may be informal agreements and implicit understandings which result in a great amount of informal control over decentral recommendations. In both these cases, the fact that there were no rejections would not necessarily imply that there was no central administrative control. However, if central administrators merely serve as a rubber stamp instead of serving in an executive capacity in the university hierarchy, then no rejections mean no control.

Some of the comments by business college deans imply infrequent central control decisions:

> The department chairman and I agree upon recommendations. Rarely, are our recommendations denied.

> I have final, ultimate authority.

Moreover, the infrequent use of central administrative control seems inherent in some decentralized administrations' interpretation of promotion policies. For example, a dean declared:

> In 9 years I have had only one person who did not receive a promotion whom I recommended. None were ever promoted without my recommendation. If the President begins a practice of changing the recommendation of the Dean and Department Chairman, then I will be interested in a change of policy.

Department heads also made many comments about their recommendations for promotion:

> I recommend. The rejection is at a higher level. To date, I have had no recommendations rejected.
>
> I have never had one of my recommendations rejected.
>
> My recommendations have been followed in nearly all instances.

These comments infer infrequent central control decisions. Several faculty members also observed the control central administrators exercise in the promotion process. The following observations imply central administrative rubber-stamping:

> The central administrative level gives virtually automatic approval except in unusual cases.
>
> The Dean then recommends to the university administration and they in turn recommend to the Regents. I doubt if a recommendation by our Dean is challenged at either of the higher levels except on the basis of budget.

Furthermore, universities utilizing faculty committees in the promotion process seldom have their decisions overruled by central administration. Comments such as the following support this view:

> At our institution the faculty promotion committee (all-university) makes recommendations which are seldom overridden by [the central administration].

These supplementary comments, coupled with the fact that half the central administrators reportedly seldom reject decentral recommendations, suggest that central control may be lacking in many universities. Typical would be the president who claimed he was not a rubber stamp. Yet, as he continued, he decided that because of the excessive work load, he could be nothing but a rubber stamp.

Simply because the other half of the central administrators reported that they sometimes reject recommendations from below does not necessarily mean they *are* exercising control. They may have rejected the recommendation for promotion from a purely subjective, personal basis and not because established promotion standards were not met. The inquiry into the reasons for rejections yielded the following types of responses:

> Insufficient stature as a scholar in his field.
>
> In recent years, because man recommended lacks qualifications. Earlier because finances limited possible number of raises in rank.
>
> Lack of highest degree and insufficient length of service.
>
> Insufficient evidence of high quality teaching and creative activity and research.
>
> Lack of interest in his work.

Inherent in each of these responses may be control decisions based upon deviations from established standards. However, rejection may also be the result of subjective feelings of the university administrators. Noteworthy was the fact that only three central administrators (5 per cent of the respondents) gave direct responses indicating a control decision based upon deviations from standards. These three responses stated the reasons for rejecting a promotion:

> Failure to meet the criteria as published in the Faculty Handbook.
>
> Evidence lacking based on University criteria.
>
> Because in our judgment the staff member does not meet published requirements.

The investigator found about the same frequency of deans' rejections of positive recommendations from below as was reported by central administrators (see Table 5-15). The reasons for rejection were also similar to those given by central administrators. Deans rejected promotions for the following reasons:

> Lack of evidence concerning research and publications, teaching, and public service contributions.
>
> Lack of evidence of scholarly accomplishments.
>
> Not yet admitted to Graduate School [Faculty] or not yet long enough in grade.
>
> Lack of "significant" contributions as a teacher, researcher, and campus leader.

Department heads reportedly reject positive recommendations from the next lower level (the faculty) much more frequently than do central administrators and deans. However, basically the same reasons were given for their rejections:

> Poor performance and interest.
>
> Ineffective teaching, uncooperative, and non-research activity.
>
> Poor teaching and poor work habits.

> Lack of professional contribution through research, outstanding teaching or service.

As a whole, the decentral administrators gave very few specific responses which indicated that control decisions were based upon deviations from standards. Only the two following responses implied the direct use of control decisions to reject promotions:

> Lack of evidence of a positive contribution commensurate with standards for that rank.
>
> Lack of confidence in long-run total contribution to our objectives.

Despite the lack of evidence for specific control decisions, there may be better control at the decentral level of the university than was found at the central level. The better control could evolve from the closer working relationship between the business college dean and his department heads. This close relationship probably results in many informal agreements and implicit understandings of standards and necessary criteria for promotions. In other words, the dean controls the recommendations of his department heads in the sense that the department head knows what he can and what he cannot get through the dean. Standards are implicitly understood, and deviations from them can be more readily determined by decentral administrators. Can central administrators also rely on their subjective judgments to evaluate and control decentral administration and faculty performance? The analysis of promotion practices found that central administrators should utilize more objective evaluations and depend on decentral evaluations of faculty performance. Yet, central administrators must still maintain the standards of the university through effective

Table 5-15

Frequency of Decentral Administrators' Rejection of a Positive Recommendation from Below

	Deans' rejection of department heads recommendations		*Department heads' rejection of faculty members recommendations*	
Frequency of rejection	*Number*	*Per cent*	*Number*	*Per cent*
Never	0	0	0	0
Very seldom	16	48	10	31
Sometimes	17	52	22	69
Quite often	0	0	0	0
Total	33	100	32	100

control! The next section analyzes this control with regard to the research standards of the university.

Central control of research standards

Research activity seems to be the most objective criterion for top administrations' evaluation of faculty performance. All three levels of the university—central and decentral administrations and faculties—rated research activity as having the greatest weight in promotion decisions. Teaching effectiveness also rated high but was assumed to have less importance in actual practice because of evaluation difficulties. Faculty members' comments such as the following pointed to these teaching evaluation problems:

> Teaching would probably have more weight if it could be effectively measured. At present I know of no way to do this. Our University had the most elaborate statistical student rating of faculty I've seen—still it was not adequate.
>
> . . . It is most difficult for our superiors to evaluate our teaching ability effectively. I believe the extremes in teaching ability (superior and incompetent) can be detected but between these extremes it is difficult to rate teaching effectiveness.

The difficulty was shown to increase as one progressed up the organizational ladder. Table 5-9 showed almost no faculty members who felt that the central level could evaluate their teaching. Therefore, central administration seems almost forced to depend upon decentral administration for the evaluation of teaching. However, to control the promotion decisions of the decentral administration and thus maintain the standards of the entire university, central administrations probably must rely more on the research criterion for promotion.

Besides being an effective check for central control, research by faculty members also contributes to the goals and purpose of the university. The research implications in the purposes of universities are brought out by policy statements such as the following:

> The basic purposes of a modern university are to educate at advanced level the people of the community which it serves and to raise the intellectual, moral, and economic standards of society. More specifically, these purposes embrace not only the training of the youth of the community to work and live most effectively and happily within the bounds of known arts, sciences, and skills, but of necessity must envisage the advancement of the frontiers of knowledge in each area of possible study, the relentless and continuing pursuit of truth in religion, philosophy and every art, science and skill.

Research also plays an important role in the goals of the various decentralized colleges and departments of the university. For example, a decentral administrator stated the objectives of his department in the college of business as follows:

1. Build a strong research component,
2. Develop and maintain a challenging graduate program,
3. Recruit very good faculty and students, and
4. Maintain mutually beneficial relations with industry.

To achieve these stated objectives, the faculty members should do research. This faculty responsibility is brought out by the following statement taken from a faculty handbook:

> A member of the faculty has the further responsibility to engage in scholarly activity that makes a constructive contribution beyond the confines of his classroom. Unless otherwise informed, he is expected to explore, investigate, analyze, and interpret phenomena significant to his subject area and to publish his findings in publications of stature. In other words, he is expected to "produce" research.

This importance attached to faculty members' research activity probably prompted a president to declare:

> For a man who is tops in his field, which would be a criterion for promotion to full professor, it would be hard to conceive of him doing no research.

Applied to central control, this means that unless the purpose of the university or standards for promotion change, top administrators should verify that those faculty members who are promoted to full professor have a significant amount of research.

Table 5-16 shows that well over half the central administrators reported they sometimes approve promotions to full professor for faculty members who have few, if any, publications. Moreover, there was evidence from the faculty survey to suggest that the central administrators' responses were quite conservative. Table 5-3 showed that practically one-third of the

Table 5-16

Frequency of Central Administrators' Approval of Promotions to Full Professor to Faculty Members Who Have Few, If Any, Publications

Frequency of promotions with no publication record	*Number of respondents*	*Percentage of respondents*
Never	2	4
Very seldom	18	38
Sometimes	27	58
Quite often	0	0
Total	47	100

full professors and almost half the associate professors surveyed had very few, if any, publications prior to becoming an associate or full professor. This substantial number of faculty members who have no significant publication record represent the college of business only; yet, 42 per cent of their central administrators claim they *seldom* promote to full professor a man without a good publication record.

What implications do these results have for the analysis of central control? If central promotion standards and the purpose of the university specifically state that research is the important criterion for promotion but central administrators do not verify that these standards of performance are met, then effective central control does not exist. The substantial number of full professors without a publication record prior to being promoted would seem to infer a lack of central control over present research standards for promotion.[1]

The investigation of research standards also suggested that central control over decentral administration may be inadequate. The analysis of universities containing full professor respondents who had zero to three published articles prior to their promotion revealed the following:

1. Sixty-two per cent of the central administrators in these universities seldom reject a recommendation from decentral administration.
2. Three-fourths of the decentral administrators in these universities indicated their policies were independent from the central policies.
3. A majority of the decentral administrators in these universities reported they sometimes recommend for full professor, faculty members who have no publication record.

The effect the above analysis has on central control can be presented as follows:

1. Decentral administrators review a man for promotion. They evaluate him according to decentral policy which may be quite different from central policy. The standards for research at the decentral level may not be very high. The man being evaluated has no publications but is perceived as a good teacher. The decentral administrator recommends to the central administration that this man be promoted to full professor.
2. The central administration seldom rejects the decentral promotion decision. The man is promoted to full professor even though the university purpose and promotion standards state that research activity is the important criterion for promotion.

---

[1] In a few cases professors without a substantial publication record may have been promoted before the present administrator assumed office or before a change in policy. This possibility was held to a minimum by selecting full professors who had been promoted within the past five years.

Comments by faculty members support such an interpretation. A full professor who had no publications stated:

> My promotions were prior to the present plan and were largely the decision of the college Dean.

Therefore, in situations such as this, there was a lack of central control over decentral promotion decisions.

In summary, this section analyzed the direct use of central control in the specified population's business faculty promotions. The analysis proceeded along two dimensions. First, it was found that about half the central administrators seldom, if ever, rejected decentral administration's positive recommendations. Supplementary comments by deans, department heads, and faculty members implied that the infrequent central administrative rejection was not necessarily the result of perfect accord between standards and performance or strict informal control. Rather, central administration's approval in many cases was viewed as a "rubber-stamp" or "automatic."

The second area of analysis was central control over research standards of the specified universities. Here it was found that, although research is a basic purpose of the university and the most widely recognized standard for promotion, over half the central administrators reported they sometimes approve for full professor, faculty members who have no significant publication record. The faculty sample, with practically a third of the full professors having only zero to three publications prior to their promotion, would indicate either the central administrators were very conservative in their response, or possibly they are not even aware that so many promotions had been made. This lack of awareness could be the result of poor feedback communication. Moreover, the analysis of universities with full professors who have no publication record indicated poor central control over decentral promotion policies and practices.

In total, the investigation and analysis indicated that many central administrators are not applying the standards of their universities to their own promotion decisions and are not controlling the decentralized promotion decisions.

Chapter VI

Some Concluding Comments

The large universities of today present a tremendous challenge for academic administration. A search of the literature indicated that practicing university administrators and administrative scientists have not entirely met this challenge. This study was undertaken to describe and analyze one phase of academic administration—the faculty promotion process.

The applicability of management concepts to the study of academic administration was discussed in Chapter I. The unique administrative problems created by certain organizational characteristics and the dual authority structure were pointed out and discussed. Despite these differing aspects of universities, the management process remains as an essential concept in the analysis of academic administration. In particular, centralized control over decentralized operations seems to be an appropriate analytical tool for the study. This concept is not associated with bureaucratic rules or authoritarianism. Rather, the ideas of standards and goals are closely related to central control in this study. Control in this sense means the establishment and maintenance of standards which will achieve desired goals.

In a university where the faculty members play such an important role in the attainment of goals, control over promotions would seem crucial for organizational success. This certainly does not mean central administrators should exercise autocratic authority through a rigid system of bureaucratic rules. On the contrary, effective control would primarily evolve from the decentral administrators and even the faculty members themselves. Critical self-appraisal and contribution to standards for promotion are required for effective academic administrative control. The question to be answered, however, is whether this is all the control that is necessary in today's university. Effective control of promotions based solely on self or decentral administrators infers two basic assumptions: 1) the individual or his decentral administrator are capable of determining that the standards for promotion have been met or not met; and 2) the standards the individual or decentral administrator are using will assure maximum contribution to the goals of the university. If this were the case, universities would need no central control because faculty members would always strive to make a maximum effort to attain the goals of their university and would promote themselves accordingly. Some excellent universities undoubtedly have this capacity. The harsh reality, however, is that this is not always the case. Faculty members both individually and collectively under a decentral administrator do not always set standards which facilitate the attainment of university goals. Moreover, faculty members or their decentral administrators do not always verify that standards have been met but nevertheless feel a promotion is deserved. In such universities a dynamic central administration seems necessary. Centralized control would be required to verify that standards are established in accordance with the goals of the university. Once these standards are established, central administration must verify that they are carried out in decentralized promotion practices.

With this a priori reasoning serving as background information, the following model served as the framework for analysis of central control of decentralized promotions:

1. The goals of the university should become integrated into a well-established promotion policy. This policy becomes the norm for the following:
   a. faculties' performance,
   b. decentral policies,
   c. promotion practices, and
   d. control decisions.
2. The promotion policies should be understood and accepted by all the participants in the university.
3. Finally, if feedback indicates that the university standards are not in accord with performance, then a control decision must be made. Such control decision may infer two types of action:
   a. The decision may be made to re-examine the present standards.
   b. Organizational sanctions may be applied to maintain present standards.

This three-step model also serves as a frame of reference for the conclusions.

To put the conclusions into their proper perspective, some of the major limitations of the study should be re-emphasized. First, there are some problems in the questionnaire method of obtaining information. The major problem is that the questionnaire responses may not reflect actual behavior. Moreover, the informal relationships and agreements in the promotion process may not be brought to the surface. The author tried to minimize these problems through the use of supplementary and open-end responses and intraorganizational analysis of administrators and faculty. The faculty members' responses often indicated administrators' behavior and conversely. The second point which should be emphasized is that the results and conclusions apply only to the specified population. The study was based on analysis of survey results and not on a rigorous statistical analysis. The results and conclusions are applicable only to large state universities' central controls over business faculty promotions to full professor.

SUMMARY

Only 8 per cent of the faculty sample felt their present promotion process was well accepted and contributed to high morale. Many possible reasons are cited in the literature for this situation. These reasons, however, are generally based on subjective judgments from personal experience or limited observation. The promotion process in 46 large universities was systematically analyzed in this study. The results of this analysis suggest that there is a lack of effective central control over faculty promotion policies and practices.

Conclusions concerning promotion policies

The central promotion policy serves as the norm or standard for faculty members' performance, decentral promotion policies and practices, and central administrative control decisions. The importance of these promotion policies was brought out by the study. Almost all faculty members who reported a nonexistent, vague, or confused policy were also dissatisfied with the promotion process in general.

A well-formulated, understood, and accepted promotion policy is necessary for effective faculty administration. The investigation did not reveal such policies in most universities. While central administrators gave the impression of well-established university-wide policies, the decentral administrators and faculties gave quite a different picture. Some professors reported there were no policies, and a substantial number of others described their policies as confused and nebulous. Moreover, two-thirds of the decentral administrators implied that their colleges or departments did not necessarily follow the central norms for promotion.

Formulation of policies. Policies are formed whenever decisions serve as precedents to performance and practice. However, in a formal sense, policies generally evolve from consciously directed individual or plural executive action. The study showed that administrators and faculties are equally responsible for forming present promotion policies. Most respondents reported they would prefer to give the faculties more influence in policy-making. The case for faculty participation in policy formulation evolves from traditions of academic freedom and the sense of community in institutions of higher learning. From a management viewpoint, faculty participation recognizes the professional status and expertise faculty members would have in setting their own standards of performance. Moreover, faculty participation would contribute to better understanding and acceptance of promotion policies. However, after the policies have been formed by the faculty, the administration must carry them out in practice.

Content of policies. The purpose of this study was not to enter into the teaching versus research controversy. However, the study did verify that these two criteria play the major role in promotion policies and practices. Research and teaching should probably not be considered as separate standards. Introductory courses at the undergraduate level may not require research from the instructing faculty member. However, in graduate instruction, it would be hard to visualize a good teacher who did no research. A president asked:

> How can a professor teach graduate students how to do research when he has done no research himself?

Dynamic teachers must keep up with their field, continually revise class notes, combine and reshape present theories, and develop new theories and approaches to the subject matter they are teaching.

How can these desirable qualities be incorporated into a promotion policy? The exact content of the policy would depend on the purposes of the institution and probably cannot be reduced to any numerical weighting of promotion criteria. A professor brings this out by stating:

> I don't know that we should have given weights for all people. Each person has his strengths and limitations and these should be considered in the promotion procedures. Given the person, he should be encouraged to make his maximum contribution whatever his strength may be.

However, the promotion policies should specifically spell out the means to achieve this "maximum contribution" *to the goals of the universities.* Therefore, if the goals of the university are to advance knowledge, serve the state, or even to become the Harvard west of the Mississippi, then the content of the promotion policy must be appropriate to achieve maximum faculty contribution to these goals.

Communication of policies. If the well-formulated policy is to serve as an effective norm for faculty performance, decentral policies and practices, and central control, the policy must be fully communicated and the results fed back. However, in most universities analyzed this did not seem to be the case. An ineffective communication process may explain the discrepancies between various respondents' descriptions of the promotion process. Moreover, the lack of effective control may result from poor feedback. On the surface most universities seemed to have a well-established line of communication via the recommendation procedure. However, further investigation indicated that this may be ineffective. The investigation of research standards found almost a third of the full professors sampled had very few, if any, publications prior to becoming full professors. Yet, practically half the central administrators in these same universities claimed they seldom, if ever, promoted such a man. This result seems to imply that central administrators were not aware that so many promotions were made.[1]

Conclusions concerning promotion practices

In most universities there was found to be an orderly progression of recommendations from the professor's colleagues to the president. However, this recommendation procedure by itself tells nothing of the methods of evaluation. Evaluations based only on recommendations from below are inadequate. To serve an effective evaluation function, administrators should utilize a consistent independent method of evaluation to supplement the recommendations. Methods of evaluation such as maintaining current bibliographies, reading faculty publications, accumulating book reviews, ranking the relative importance of various journals in each field of study, noting the quantity of distribution of books and articles, and utilizing objective teaching reports are not widely used by central or decentral administrators.

Most faculty members felt that under present procedures their department heads and deans could make objective evaluations of teaching and research. This probably results from the fact that decentral administrators do not necessarily need objective methods to make an evaluation. Business college deans and department heads generally have intimate day-to-day contact and general understanding of their faculty members' specialized research and teaching. Nevertheless, an effective promotion process would require the decentral administrators to use more objective methods of evaluation. If decentral administrators are forced to back up their positive or negative recommendations to central administration with such things as bibliographies, published books and articles, or even unpublished manuscripts, there would be a more effective promotion process.

---

[1] This conclusion in particular points out the possible difference between questionnaire response and actual behavior. For instance, university presidents or vice-presidents may not like to admit that they have full professors with no publications. Nevertheless, it would be fairly safe to assume that part of the problem in this situation was ineffective communication about faculty performance.

Almost no business professors felt that under present practices their academic vice-president or president could make objective evaluations of teaching or research. Yet, evaluations are made by these central administrators every time a professor is promoted or is not promoted. What are these evaluations based upon? Central administrators do not generally have intimate knowledge of faculty members to make subjective evaluations. They must depend more upon objective methods of evaluation. The specialized nature of professors' research and the almost impossible job of evaluating teaching makes such evaluations a formidable task. Nevertheless, if central administrators are to perform an effective evaluative function, any type of consistent, objective method would be better than evaluations made solely on the basis of recommendations from below. This does not deny that in the final decision, central administrators must still primarily rely on those below to make the evaluations. However, if the university is to maintain its standards and hence achieve its objectives, this reliance must not go unchecked. Central administrators must exercise control over recommendations from below!

Conclusions concerning central control decisions

Effective control includes the use of administrative control decisions if standards and performance are not in accord. These control decisions consist of re-examination of standards and/or the use of organizational sanctions to gain compliance with standards. The author found that such decisions were seldom made by central administrators.

Almost half the central administrators reported they seldom, if ever, rejected recommendations from below. This finding does not necessarily mean that no control exists. Informal agreements and implicit understandings between central and decentral administrators may limit the number of rejections but control remains at the top. However, supplementary comments implied that the infrequent rejections were not necessarily the result of this informal control nor were they the result of perfect accord between university standards and decentral administrators' recommendations. On the contrary, the central administrators were generally depicted as a "rubber-stamp" with "automatic approval." This interpretation was substantiated when control of research standards was analyzed.

The investigator found that research was a basic purpose of the university and the most widely recognized standard for promotion. Despite these research standards, over half the central administrators reported they sometimes promote faculty members who have few, if any, publications. Finally, the discussion of communication disclosed that the publication record of the faculty sample implied many more full professors who had no significant publication record prior to being promoted were promoted than central administration realized or cared to admit. Therefore, the circumstantial evidence seems to indicate that central administrators are guilty of not using control decisions to maintain the standards of their university.

IMPLICATIONS

The conclusions have several implications for academic administration. First, there seems to be a need for improved promotion policies. These policies should reflect the purpose and goals of the university and serve as standards for faculty performance, decentral policies and practices, and central control decisions. Second, there is indication for the need of improved promotion practices. A step in this direction would be more objective methods of evaluation at all levels of the university. Finally, evolving from and a basis for improved policies and practices is the need for improved central controls. Central control of the promotion process is necessary to maintain standards and thus assure maximum faculty contributions to the goals of the university.

If there are no central controls, the decentral administrators have a free hand concerning the reasons why faculty members are promoted or are not promoted. The possible consequence may be the inbreeding of a substandard faculty. The following situation could possibly occur:

> The faculty members of the college are complacent about doing research and use the same class notes year after year. The dean (or department head) is an undynamic individual who deliberately (or nondeliberately) perpetuates his own inadequacies by promoting these substandard faculty members. The university standards state that significant research contributions and dynamic teaching are required for promotion. Yet, year after year, the college dean (or department head) "pushes through" his recommendations because there are no effective central controls.

One way to overcome the above situation would be careful selection and development of decentral administrators. However, in most universities today, the faculties have the major voice in selecting their own administrators. Therefore, a substandard faculty may select one of their own kind to preserve the status quo. Developing administrators on the job may also be foreign to universities. John J. Corson stated:

> . . . academic administrators are most often teachers who more or less "back in" to administration; they tend to assume that what there is to be known about administration can be picked up as one goes along. The idea of sys-

tematic training for administrative posts—an idea generally accepted in business—is not generally accepted, and is even considered bizarre, in academia.[2]

The best way to overcome the hypothetical situation and thus facilitate maximum faculty contribution to the goals of the university would be improved central administrative control. This was expressed by President Dodds as follows:

> This strong departmental discretion in selection and promotion tends to strengthen built-in forces of deterioration which the president and his administration must counteract. The quality of the faculty is a personal responsibility from which no president should seek to escape. . . . I suggest . . . that research will reveal a positive correlation between long-run faculty excellence and the manner and quality of presidential participation in selections and promotions.[3]

Although it would be difficult to determine a "faculty excellence," central control correlation, this study did find a positive correlation between seemingly unsatisfactory promotion policies and practices and inadequate central control. If central administrators would revitalize the academic promotion process through effective control, they would be taking a stride forward in meeting the administrative challenges of the large universities of today.

---

[2] John J. Corson, *Governance of Colleges and Universities* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1960), p. 200.

[3] Harold W. Dodds, "Some Thoughts on the University Presidency," *Public Administration Review*, Vol. 20, No. 1 (Winter, 1960), p. 13.

Bibliography

BOOKS

Albers, Henry H. *Principles of Organization and Management.* (2nd ed.). New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1965.

Barnard, Chester I. *The Functions of the Executive.* Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1962.

Benjamin, Harold (ed.). *Democracy in the Administration of Higher Education.* New York: Harper & Brothers, 1950.

Blau, Peter M. and Scott, W. Richard. *Formal Organizations.* San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Company, 1962.

Bonini, Charles P., Jaedicke, R. E. and Wagner, Harvey M. (eds.). *Management Controls.* New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1964.

Brim, Orville G. *Sociology and the Field of Education.* New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1958.

Burns, Gerald P. (ed.). *Administrators in Higher Education.* New York: Harper & Brothers, 1962.

Byse, Clark and Joughin, Louis. *Tenure in American Higher Education.* Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1959.

Capen, Sammuel P. *The Management of Universities.* Boston: Foster and Stewart, 1953.

Caplow, Theodore and McGee, Reece. *The Academic Marketplace.* New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1958.

Carlson, Sune. *Executive Behavior.* Stockholm: C. A. Stromberg Aktiebolog, Publisher, 1951.

Cattell, J. McKeen. *University Control.* New York: The Science Press, 1913.

Cooley, Charles H. *Life and the Student: Roadside Notes on Human Nature, Society, and Letters.* New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1934.

Cornford, F. M. *Microcosmogrophia Academica.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1945.

Corson, John J. *Governance of Colleges and Universities.* New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1960.

Cronkhite, Bernice Brown (ed.). *A Handbook for College Teachers.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1950.

Dalton, Melville. *Men Who Manage.* New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1959.

Deutsch, Monroe E. *The College from Within.* Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 1952.

Diekhoff, John S. *The Domain of the Faculty.* New York: Harper & Brothers, 1956.

Dodds, Harold W. *The Academic President—Educator or Caretaker?* New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1962.

Fayol, Henri. *General and Industrial Management.* London: Sir Isaac Pitman & Sons, Ltd., 1949.

Freedman, Morris. *Chaos in Our Colleges*. New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1963.

Glaze, Thomas Edward. *Business Administration for Colleges and Universities*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1962.

Gordon, Robert A. and Howell, James E. *Higher Education for Business*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1959.

Gouldner, Alvin W. *Patterns of Industrial Bureaucracy*. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1954.

Guthrie, E. R. *The State University–Its Function and Its Future*. Seattle: University of Washington, 1959.

Jones, Thomas E., Stanford, Edward V. and White, Goodrich C. *Letters to College Presidents*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964.

Kerr, Clark. *The Uses of the University*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1963.

Kruisinga, H. J. (ed.). *The Balance Between Centralization and Decentralization in Managerial Control*. Leiden: H. E., Stenfert, Kroese, N. V., 1954.

Lazarsfeld, Paul F. and Sieber, Sam P. *Organizing Educational Research*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964.

Lazarsfeld, Paul F. and Thielens, Wagner. *The Academic Mind*. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1958.

Lindsay, E. E. and Holland, E. O. *College and University Administration*. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1930.

March, James G. and Simon, Herbert A. *Organizations*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1958.

McConnell, Thomas R. *A General Pattern for American Public Higher Education*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1962.

McGlothlin, William J. *Patterns of Professional Education*. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1960.

McVey, Frank L. and Hughes, Raymond M. *Problems of College and University Administration*. Ames, Iowa: Iowa State College Press, 1952.

Merton, Robert K. *Social Theory and Social Structure*. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1949.

Millett, John D. *The Academic Community*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1962.

Mooney, James D. and Reiley, Alan C. *The Principles of Organization*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1939.

Morrill, James Lewis. *The Ongoing State University*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1960.

Nevins, Allan. *The State Universities and Democracy*. Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 1962.

Nielsen, Oswald (ed.). *University Administration in Practice*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Graduate School of Business, 1959.

Perkins, John A. *Plain Talk from a Campus*. Newark, Delaware: University of Delaware Press, 1959.

Pierson, Frank C. and Others. *The Education of American Businessmen.* New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1959.

Prator, Ralph. *The College President.* Washington: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1963.

Riesman, David. *Constraint and Variety in American Education.* Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1958.

Sanford, Nevitt (ed.). *The American College.* New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1962.

Scroggs, Schiller. *Systematic Fact Finding and Research in the Administration of Higher Education.* Ann Arbor, Michigan: Edwards Brothers, 1935.

Selznick, Philip. *Leadership in Administration.* Evanston, Illinois: Row, Peterson Company, 1957.

Sheldon, Oliver. *The Philosophy of Management.* London: Sir Isaac Pitman and Sons, Ltd., 1923.

Simon, Herbert A. *Administrative Behavior* (2nd ed.). New York: The Macmillan Co., 1960.

Sinclair, Upton. *The Goose-Step.* Pasadena, California: Published by the Author, 1923.

Smith, Adam. *The Wealth of Nations,* 1776. London: Methuen and Company, Ltd., 1904. Vol. I, pp. 133-136, and Vol. II, pp. 249-253.

Stoke, Harold W. *The American College President.* New York: Harper & Brothers, 1959.

Tead, Ordway. *Administration: Its Purposes and Performance.* New York: Harper & Brothers, 1959.

Tead, Ordway. *The Art of Administration.* New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1951.

Thompson, Victor A. *Modern Organization.* New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1962.

Veblen, Thorstein. *The Higher Learning in America.* New York: B. W. Huebsch, 1918.

Waldo, Dwight (ed.). *Ideas and Issues in Public Administration.* New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1953.

Weber, Max. *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization.* (Translated by A. M. Henderson and Talcott Parsons). New York: Oxford University Press, 1947.

Williams, George. *Some of My Best Friends Are Professors.* New York: Abelard-Schuman, 1958.

Williams, R. M. *American Society.* New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1952, pp. 298-299.

Wilson, Logan. *The Academic Man.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1942.

Woodburne, Lloyd S. *Faculty Personnel Policies in Higher Education.* New York: Harper & Brothers, 1950.

Woodburne, Lloyd S. *Principles of College and University Administration.* Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1958.

Wriston, Henry M. *Academic Procession.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1959.

Yoder, Dale. *Personnel Management and Industrial Relations* (5th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1962.

PERIODICALS

Ashby, Eric. "A University Presidency: What It Takes," *Saturday Review* (November 21, 1964), pp. 58-59; 77-78.

Bowen, Howard R. "Business Management: A Profession?" *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science,* Vol. 297 (January, 1955), pp. 112-117.

Brickman, William W. "Research, Scholarship, and Teaching in the University," *School and Society,* Vol. 89, No. 2184 (January 14, 1961), p. 18.

Call, Rex V. "Faculty and Morale," *Journal of Higher Education,* Vol. 29, No. 5 (May, 1958), pp. 267-271.

Carey, James C. "University or Corporations?" *Journal of Higher Education,* Vol. 27, No. 8 (November, 1956), pp. 440-444.

Cavanaugh, James. "Academic Administration: Its Place in the Sun," *American Association of University Professors Bulletin,* Vol. 43, No. 4 (Winter, 1957), pp. 630-634.

Chambers, M. M. "Who Writes About College and University Administration?" *School and Society,* Vol. 88, No. 2181 (November 19, 1960), pp. 444-445.

Christopherson, Victor A. "Dilemmas of Administration in Higher Education," *Journal of Higher Education,* Vol. 26, No. 4 (April, 1955), pp. 210-214.

Clark, Burton R. "Faculty Authority," *American Association of University Professors Bulletin,* Vol. 47, No. 4 (December, 1961), pp. 293-302.

Cleveland, Harland. "The Dean's Dilemma: Leadership of Equals," *Public Administration Review,* Vol. 20, No. 1 (Winter, 1960), pp. 22-27.

Cogan, Morris L. "The Problem of Defining a Profession," *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science,* Vol. 297 (January, 1955), pp. 105-107.

Corson, John J. "The University—A Contrast in Administrative Process," *Public Administration Review,* Vol. 20, No. 1 (Winter, 1960), pp. 2-9.

Dale, Ernest. "Contributions to Administration by Alfred P. Sloan, Jr., and GM," *Administrative Science Quarterly,* Vol. 1, No. 1 (June, 1956), pp. 39-61.

Darlington, James M. "Faculty-Administration Relationships," *American Association of University Professors Bulletin,* Vol. 46, No. 3 (September, 1960), pp. 265-268.

Davidson, Carter. "Industrial Techniques for Higher Education," *Journal of Higher Education,* Vol. 26, No. 8 (November, 1955), pp. 408-412; 456-457.

Dickason, Donald E. "A Personnel Policy for the College Faculty," *School and Society,* Vol. 69, No. 1793 (April 30, 1949), pp. 314-315.

Dodds, Harold W. "Some Thoughts on the University Presidency," *Public Administration Review,* Vol. 20, No. 1 (Winter, 1960), pp. 10-16.

Drucker, Peter F. "Management and the Professional Employee," *Harvard Business Review*, Vol. 30, No. 3 (May-June, 1952), pp. 84-91.

Etzioni, Amitai. "Authority Structure and Organizational Effectiveness," *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 4, No. 1 (June, 1959), pp. 43-68.

Fesler, James W. "In Analyzing University Administration," *Public Administration Review*, Vol. 20, No. 1 (Winter, 1960), p. 59.

Haas, Eugene and Collen, Linda. "Administrative Practices in University Departments," *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 8, No. 1 (June, 1963), pp. 44-61.

Hall, Richard H. "Intraorganizational Structural Variation: Application of the Bureaucratic Model," *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 7, No. 3 (December, 1962), pp. 295-309.

Henderson, Algo D. "Finding and Training Academic Administrators," *Public Administration Review*, Vol. 20, No. 1 (Winter, 1960), pp. 17-22.

Hodges, Henry G. "Management of Universities," *Southern Economic Journal*, Vol. XIX, No. 1 (July, 1952), pp. 79-89.

Keenan, Boyd R. "The Need for Closer Conformity to the Business Model," *Journal of Higher Education*, Vol. 32, No. 9 (December, 1961), pp. 513-515.

Lentz, Edith M. "Hospital Administration—One of a Species," *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 1, No. 4 (March, 1957), pp. 444-464.

Lippincott, Benjamin E. and McLaughlin, Charles H. "Personnel Administration in a Department of Political Science," *American Association of University Professors Bulletin*, Vol. 44, No. 3 (September, 1958), pp. 641-647.

Litchfield, Edward H. "Organization in Large American Universities—The Administration," *Journal of Higher Education*, Vol. 30, No. 9 (December, 1959), pp. 489-504.

Litchfield, Edward H. "Organization in Large American Universities—The Faculty," *Journal of Higher Education*, Vol. 30, No. 7 (October, 1959), pp. 353-364.

Litchfield, Edward H. "Notes on a General Theory of Administration," *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 1, No. 1 (June, 1956), pp. 3-29.

Martin, Ken. "An Equitable Basis for Faculty Promotions and Salary Increases," *College and University Business*, Vol. 25, No. 3 (September, 1958), p. 40.

Maul, Roy C. "The Quest for Competent Instructional Staff," *Journal of Higher Education*, Vol. 26, No. 2 (February, 1955), pp. 69-74.

McEwen, William J. "Position Conflict and Professional Orientation in a Research Organization," *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 1, No. 2 (September, 1956), pp. 208-225.

Millett, John D. "How the Management Consultant Can Help," *College and University Business*, Vol. 25, No. 4 (October, 1958), pp. 40-43.

Millett, John D. "The Job of Management," *College and University Business*, Vol. 25, No. 3 (September, 1958), pp. 22-24.

Miner, John B. "Conformity Among University Professors and Business Executives," *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 7, No. 1 (June, 1962), pp. 96-110.

Page, Charles. "Bureaucracy and Higher Education," *Journal of General Education*, Vol. V, No. 2 (January, 1951), pp. 91-100.

Paget, Richard. "Operating Costs and University Management: Methods to Effect Economies," *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, Vol. 297 (January, 1955), pp. 112-117.

Parsons, Talcott. "Suggestions for a Sociological Approach to the Theory of Organizations—I and II," *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 1, No. 1 (June, 1956), pp. 63-85; and Vol. 1, No. 2 (September, 1956), pp. 225-239.

Parsons, William W. "The Personnel Function in Public Management," *Public Administration Review*, Vol. 17, No. 3 (Summer, 1957), pp. 149-156.

Perkins, James A. "The Campus—Forgotten Field of Study," *Public Administration Review*, Vol. 20, No. 1 (Winter, 1960), pp. 1-2.

Presthus, Robert V. "Toward a Theory of Organizational Behavior," *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 3, No. 1 (June, 1958), pp. 48-72.

Randolph, Robert L. "Administrative Design and Functional Need," *Journal of Higher Education*, Vol. 32, No. 9 (December, 1961), pp. 515-516.

Riesman, David. "Planning in Higher Education: Some Notes on Patterns and Problems," *Human Organization*, Vol. 18, No. 1 (Spring, 1959), pp. 12-17.

Rourke, Francis E. and Brooks, Glenn E. "The 'Managerial Revolution' in Higher Education," *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 9, No. 2 (September, 1964), pp. 154-182.

Russell, John D. "Some Reflections Concerning University Administration," *American Association of University Professors Bulletin*, Vol. 35, No. 3 (Autumn, 1949), pp. 476-489.

Simon, Herbert A. "Comments on the Theory of Organizations," *American Political Science Review*, Vol. XLVI, No. 4 (December, 1952), pp. 1130-1139.

Starcher, George W. "Faculty Participation in Administration," *College and University Business*, Vol. 28, No. 2 (February, 1960), p. 19.

Sullivan, Richard H. "Administrative Faculty Relationships in Colleges and Universities," *Journal of Higher Education*, Vol. 27, No. 6 (June, 1956), pp. 308-326.

Tead, Ordway. "Faculty-Administration Relationships in the Colleges of New York: A Ten Year Appraisal," *American Association of University Professors Bulletin*, Vol. 34, No. 1 (Spring, 1948), pp. 67-78.

Ten Hoor, Marten. "Personnel Problems in Academic Administration," *Liberal Education*, Vol. XLV, No. 3 (October, 1959), pp. 405-423.

Trippett, B. K. "The Role of a Faculty in College Administration," *American Association of University Professors Bulletin*, Vol. 43, No. 3 (September, 1957), pp. 484-492.

Urwick, Lyndall F. "Public Administration and Business Management," *Public Administration Review*, Vol. 17, No. 2 (Spring, 1957), pp. 77-83.

Wilson, Logan. "Academic Administration: Its Abuses and Uses," *American Association of University Professors Bulletin*, Vol. 41, No. 4 (Winter, 1955), p. 691.

Woodburne, Lloyd S. "Suggested Criteria for Academic Promotion," *American Association of University Professors Bulletin*, Vol. 29, No. 2 (April, 1943), pp. 242-256.

Worthy, James C. "Organizational Structure and Employee Morale," *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 15, No. 2 (April, 1950), pp. 169-179.

Yoder, Dale. "The Faculty Role in University Governance," *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 5, No. 3 (December, 1962), pp. 222-229.

REPORTS, PUBLIC DOCUMENTS AND MONOGRAPHS

Abbott, Frank C. (ed.) *Faculty-Administration Relationships*. Washington: American Council on Education, 1957.

American Universities and Colleges (9th ed.). Washington: American Council on Education, 1964.

Ayers, Archie R. and Russel, John H. *Internal Structure*. A monograph prepared for U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C., 1962.

Baker, Helen and France, Robert R. *Centralization and Decentralization in Industrial Relations*. Princeton, New Jersey: Industrial Relations Section, Department of Economics and Sociology, Princeton University, 1954.

Bigelow, Karl W. *Selected Books for the College and University Administrator*. New York: Bureau of Publications, Columbia University, 1958.

Bosley, Howard E. *The Administration of Faculty Personnel in State Teachers Colleges*. Oneonta, N.Y.: The American Association of Teachers Colleges, 1946.

Brumbaugh, A. J. "Institutional Research: A Basis for Planning with Special Reference to the Large Public University," in *The Role of Institutional Research in Planning*, Madison, Wisconsin: Office of Institutional Studies, 1963.

Bunnell, Kevin (ed.). *Faculty Work Load*. Washington: American Council on Education, 1960.

Burns, Norman (ed.) *The Administration of Higher Institutions Under Changing Conditions*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1947. Proceedings of the Institute for Administrative Officers of Higher Institutions, 1947.

Cooke, Morris L. *Academic and Industrial Efficiency*. New York: Report to Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1910.

Deferrari, Roy J. (ed.) *Functions of the Dean of Studies in Higher Education*. Washington: Catholic University Press, 1957.

Dennison, Charles P. *Faculty Rights and Obligations*. Columbia Teachers College: Bureau of Publications, 1955.

Dobbins, Charles G. (ed.) *Expanding Resources For College Teaching*. Washington: American Council on Education Studies. Series I Reports of Committees and Conferences, Vol. XX, No. 60, October, 1958.

Duryea, E. D. *Management of Learning*. Prepared for U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington: Government Printing Office, 1960.

Eells, Walter C. and Hollis, Ernest V. *Administration of Higher Education: An Annotated Bibliography*. Prepared for U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington: Government Printing Office, 1960.

Eells, Walter C. and Hollis, Ernest V. *The College Presidency 1900-1960: An Annotated Bibliography*. Prepared for U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington: Government Printing Office, 1961.

Ellsworth, T. D. "How Can Conditions of Work for College Faculty and Administrators Be Improved?" in *Current Issues in Higher Education*. Washington: Association for Higher Education, 1959, pp. 203-209.

Gibson, Raymond C. *Resources and Needs for Higher Education in Iowa*. Des Moines: Iowa Legislative Research Bureau, 1960.

Gustad, John W. (ed.) *Faculty Preparation and Orientation*. Winchester, Mass.: New England Board of Higher Education, 1960.

Harvard University, Committee of Eight. *Report on Some Problems of Personnel in the Faculty of Arts and Sciences*. [1947], pp. 46-51.

Henderson, Algo D. "Research Related to Decision-Making," in *The Role of Institutional Research in Planning*. Madison, Wisconsin: Office of Institutional Studies, 1963, p. 81.

Henneman, H. J. "Goals and Techniques of Business, Industry, and Government that May Be Applicable to the Administration of Higher Education," in *Current Issues in Higher Education*, Washington: Association for Higher Education, 1961, pp. 181-184.

Joyal, Arnold E. *Faculty Participation in College Policy Formulation and Administration*. Oneonta, New York: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1956.

Longnecker, Herbert E. *University Faculty Compensation Policies and Practices in the United States*. Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 1956. Published for the Association of American Universities.

Lunsford, Terry F. (ed.) *The Study of Academic Administration*. Boulder, Colorado: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1963.

Newburn, H. K. "Faculty Personnel Policies in State Universities." Missoula, Montana: Montana State University, 1959. (multilithed for limited distribution).

Personnel Practices in Colleges and Universities. A survey by the College and University Personnel Association, Champaign, Illinois, 1958.

Stecklein, John E. (Director) *How to Measure Faculty Work Load*. Washington: American Council on Education, 1961.

Stone, Donald C. "What Modifications in the Management of Institutions of Higher Education Will Be Necessary for More Effective Operation?" in *Current Issues in Higher Education 1957*. Washington: Association for Higher Education, pp. 193.

Studies of College Faculty. Berkeley, California: The Center for the Study of Higher Education, December, 1961.

Stuit, Dewey B., Helmstadter, Gerald C., and Fredriksen, Norman. *Survey of College Evaluation Methods and Needs*. Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service, 1956. A report to the Carnegie Corporation.

Wellemeyer, J. F., Jr. (ed.). *Compensation on the Campus.* Washington: Association for Higher Education, NEA, 1961.

Wilson, Logan. "A President's Perspective," *Faculty-Administration Relationships.* Report of a work conference sponsored by the Commission on Instruction and Evaluation of the American Council on Education, May 7-9, 1957.

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. *Education Directory 1963-1964, Part 3—Higher Education.* Washington: Government Printing Office, 1964.

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. *Opening Fall Enrollment in Higher Education, 1964.* Washington: Government Printing Office.

Yoakum, C. S. *Functions of the Faculty: The Work Load.* Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan Administrative Studies, Vol. 1, No. 2, 1932.